

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXIII

JANUARY, 1941

NUMBER 1

THE CHURCH

By THEODORE O. WEDEL, College of Preachers

An impartial inquirer, confronted by the official pronouncements on the Church to be found in the formularies of our two Communion would probably be struck by nothing so much as the fact that both are surprisingly scanty. On the Ministry and on the Sacraments, pages of doctrines could be gathered together. But a really adequate definition of the Church is not easily to be discovered. Particularly is this true of the formularies of the Anglican Churches. The absence in the historic Anglican Catechism of any definition of the Church whatsoever is surely remarkable. This modesty in rationalizing the ultimate mystery of the Christian Fellowship has characterized Christian theology almost since the days of the Early Church. It is notorious, to cite a slightly surprising example, that Thomas Aquinas devotes only a brief section to the subject of the Church even in his monumental *Summa*. This comparative silence on what is, after all, the fundamental fact in all ecumenical controversy—namely, the ultimate nature of the divine-human Mystery of the Church—may be momentous for the ecumenical task of our day. We may not have quarrelled about the basic definition of the

NOTE. The first three articles in this number of the REVIEW were read at the joint meeting of the Commission on Approaches to Unity of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Department of Church Cooperation and Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., held at Princeton, New Jersey, on June 18, 1940. They are published by unanimous request of both commissions.

Church because we are still of it and in it—still more of a catholic and united Body of Christ than we dream. The Church, like Jesus Christ her Lord, is still a living Reality. A living Body does not easily define or understand itself, so long as it is alive.

Certainly an Anglican, reading for the first time the official pronouncements on the Church of the Presbyterian formularies, would find little to quarrel with. Nothing in the corresponding Anglican formularies expresses a higher doctrine of the Church as such than the claims made by the Presbyterian "Confession of Faith" that out of the visible Church "there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." Conversely, one may presume that the Nineteenth Article of Religion—which was, until the latest revision of the Book of Common Prayer, the most clearly stated doctrinal statement of the nature of the Church in Anglican formularies—would not clash with much Presbyterian opinion.

If we turn, to be sure, to the "Offices of Instruction" of the latest revision of the Episcopal Prayer Book, certain contrasts with the Presbyterian formularies may be noted. The Episcopalian mode of defining the Church is in terms of liturgical or pragmatic fact, while the Presbyterian is in terms of theological doctrine. The second "Office of Instruction" bluntly defines the Church as "the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and all baptized people are the members." If the Presbyterian formularies have any phrase which might be comparable for concreteness, it would probably be the one repeated in several places that the universal Church consists of those, "Who make profession of the holy religion of Christ." The Presbyterian definition is in terms of doctrinal faith; the Episcopalian in terms of a sacrament. Yet a reading of other portions of the Presbyterian formularies clearly indicates that Baptism is not an item of contention between the two Churches. Although the Presbyterian pronouncement does not use the doctrine of Baptism in a definition of the Church as such, Baptism would certainly fall within the covering phrase which describes membership in the Church as consisting of those who "make submission" to Christ's laws.

The Prayer Book "Office of Instruction," in its continuing catechetical dialogue, does, however, touch upon one Church rite which clearly raises an issue. I refer to Confirmation. The oblique manner in which this is doctrinally validated as sharing in the nature of the Church must appear puzzling. Confirmation is not mentioned as on a par with Baptism. Yet it is calmly taken for granted as a part of Church life. Here, as so often in ecumenical controversy, the doctrinal vagueness of the Anglican churches comes to the fore as both their strength and their weakness. The Anglican Churches define themselves by what they do liturgically. Consequently, Church life itself *becomes* doctrine—or a substitute for doctrine, as the Confessional Churches conceive this. Even the Thirty-nine Articles, invaluable as they have been in providing at least a minimum basis for confessional comparisons, have always been an alien element in Anglican life and thought.

This may not be the place for a full discussion of Confirmation as it bears upon the problem of reunion. That it does have a bearing, however, is clear to every thinking member of the Episcopal Church. Does the Episcopal Church make Confirmation a necessary part of the definition of the Church itself? If the question is pressed in terms of confessional logic, probably not. A logically thought-through Confession is not part of our treasure of tradition. As said above, Church life, particularly in its liturgical form, is our substitute. But in that Church life, Confirmation holds an important place. Anglican authorities differ widely as to the way in which it ought to be doctrinally defended. According to some, it is one of the sacraments which tradition has somehow made practically *de fide*. According to others, it is merely a venerable rite. Official formularies are silent on the subject except as Confirmation is rubrically dealt with in the Prayer Book as a preliminary to Communion. As with Episcopal succession, so long as the thing itself is not disturbed, doctrinal opinion is free. Let the rite of Confirmation itself be disturbed, however, and embarrassment, or even panic, might

ensue. We would then be forced to formulate our doctrinal or confessional opinion on Confirmation. And, alas, we have none ready to hand. And we are woefully slow in making up our doctrinal minds.

I venture to say this much on the subject of Confirmation because it constitutes, among many members of the Episcopal Church, one of the two or three major areas of questioning regarding the Concordat. What will happen to Confirmation when and if a presbyter of the Presbyterian Church, with an "extended ordination," should minister to our people? Confirmation is one of the intimacies of our Church family life. Intimacies of Church life, as of family life, are sacred things to those within that family, are not easy to explain to outsiders, and are not readily given up. I would beg our Presbyterian brethren to deal understandingly with our feeling of loyalty to the Confirmation rite.

With the exception of the allusion to Confirmation in the Prayer Book "Offices of Instruction," I see no differences on the doctrine of the Church between the official pronouncements of the two Communion which should cause real difficulty in ecumenical fellowship.

Appendix:

THE CHURCH IN THE PRAYER BOOK

Doctrinal definitions of the Church are not conspicuous in the Book of Common Prayer. The historic Anglican Catechism, for example, contains no question and answer on "What is the Church?" This lack was remedied in the latest revision of the American Prayer Book by devoting the major portion of the "Second Office of Instruction" (pages 290-291) precisely to "Questions concerning the Church." This office, officially superseding the older Catechism, is the most authoritative doctrinal pronouncement on the Church in the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The pertinent questions and answers are here quoted:

Question: When were you made a member of the Church?

Answer: I was made a member of the Church when I was baptized.

Question: What is the Church?

Answer: The Church is the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and all baptized people are the members.

Question: How is the Church described in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds?

Answer: The Church is described in the Creeds as One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.

Question: What do we mean by these words?

Answer: We mean that the Church is: One; because it is one Body under one Head; Holy; because the Holy Spirit dwells in it and sanctifies its members; Catholic; because it is universal, holding earnestly the Faith for all time, in all countries, and for all people; and is sent to preach the Gospel to the whole world; Apostolic; because it continues stedfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship.

Question: What is your bounden duty as a member of the Church?

Answer: My bounden duty is to follow Christ, to worship God every Sunday in his Church; and to work and pray and give for the spread of his kingdom.

Question: What special means does the Church provide to help you do all these things?

Answer: The Church provides the Laying on of Hands, or Confirmation, wherein, after renewing the promises and vows of my Baptism, and declaring my loyalty and devotion to Christ as my Master, I receive the strengthening gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Question: After you have been confirmed, what great privilege doth our Lord provide for you?

Answer: Our Lord provides the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, for the continual strengthening and refreshing of my soul.

The "Articles of Religion" contain two articles which bear upon a doctrinal definition of the Church:

Article XIX. Of The Church—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

Article XX. Of the Authority of the Church—The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

Incidental allusions to the Church occur with some frequency in the Book of Common Prayer. Most of these are not specific enough to warrant doctrinal interpretation. A few, however, deserve quotation, since phrases from them are in frequent use:

1. The "Prayer of Thanksgiving," toward the close of the Order for Holy Communion, contains a thanksgiving to God "that we are very *members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son*, which is the *blessed company of all faithful people*; and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of his most precious death and passion." (Book of Common Prayer, page 83.)

2. The three Collects for Good Friday (page 156) are "Church Collects." The second of these is as follows:

Almighty and everlasting God, by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified; Receive our supplications and prayers, which we offer before thee for all estates of men in thy holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve thee; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

3. The Collect for the Twenty-Second Sunday after Trinity, typical of several others, opens with the phrase: "Lord, we beseech thee to keep *thy household the Church* in continual godliness . . ." (Book of Common Prayer, page 220.)

4. The closing prayer of the "Office of Institution of Ministers into Parishes or Churches":

O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; Grant that, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, all Christians may be so joined together in unity of spirit, and in the bond of peace, that they may be an holy temple acceptable unto thee. And especially to this Congregation present, give the abundance of thy grace; that with one heart they may desire the prosperity of the holy Apostolic Church, and with one mouth may profess the faith once delivered to the Saints. Defend them from the sins of heresy and schism; let not the foot of pride come nigh to hurt them, nor the hand of the ungodly to cast them down. And grant that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by thy governance, that thy Church may joyfully serve thee in all godly quietness; that so they may walk in the way of truth and peace, and at last be numbered with thy Saints in glory everlasting; through the merits of the same thy blessed Son Jesus Christ, the gracious Bishop and Shepherd of our souls, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the same Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen. (Book of Common Prayer, page 574.)

THE CHURCH IN PRESBYTERIAN FORMULARIES

Doctrinal definitions of the Church appear in both "The Confession of Faith" and in "The Form of Government." Chapter 25 of "The Confession of Faith" reads as follows:

OF THE CHURCH

I. The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.

II. The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

III. Unto this catholic visible Church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world: and doth by his own presence and spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

IV. This catholic Church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

V. The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error: and some have so degenerated, as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth, to worship God according to his will.

VI. The Lord Jesus Christ is the only head of the Church, and the claim of any man to be the vicar of Christ and the head of the Church, is unscriptural, without warrant in fact, and is a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ.

Chapter 2 of "The Form of Government" reads as follows:

OF THE CHURCH

I. JESUS CHRIST, who is now exalted far above all principality and power, hath erected, in this world, a kingdom, which is his Church.

II. The universal Church consists of all those persons, in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to his laws.

III. As this immense multitude cannot meet together in one place, to hold communion, or to worship God, it is reasonable, and warranted by Scripture example, that they should be divided into many particular churches.

IV. A particular church consists of a number of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together, for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures; and submitting to a certain form of government.

THE MINISTRY IN THE EPISCOPAL AND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES

By ANGUS DUN, Episcopal Theological School

The purpose of this paper is to compare the usage and doctrine with respect to the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church and of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Since the negotiations now going on between these two bodies with a view to reunion involve the official relations of the churches and not the private views and relationships of individuals belonging to them I shall adhere closely to official standards in the examination of the topic. I can not, however, begin the exposition without making three comments on that procedure.

The first is that no historical or living society can be judged exclusively by its legal and official standards. The actual thought and practice of its leaders and members may diverge in important particulars from its formal standards and may in some instances be quite as significant as they are. Secondly, we can not fail to recognize that the practice and doctrine of these two communions have been adopted partly in opposition to one another. That being so it is hardly possible to advance towards unity simply by projecting into the future the lines of our past and present positions. The value of such an examination as this lies in clarifying the question as to where we now stand officially. Granted that the achievement of union, partial or complete, will involve movement for both bodies, our first task is to discover the positions from which that movement must take place. My third comment is of a more theological and possibly of a more controversial nature. I shall state it rather baldly. Every institution reflecting the actualities of human life, including the Churches as visible societies, reflect inevitably the finitude and sin of man. The official standards of Churches participate in this fate. They are not let down from heaven like the New Jerusalem. They perpetuate in part the relative judgments of particular men at par-

ticular times. They are always in some measure the product of compromise. They contain what may be variously described as fictions or ambiguities or even dishonesties. I would confess this as an Episcopalian. Since it is not our business to confess other peoples' sins, I leave it to Presbyterians to say whether the same holds for them. In any case, this truth, if it be a truth, should warn us against suddenly becoming purists when it is to our interest and claiming for our standards a clarity or inerrancy which they do not possess.

I shall assume for the purpose of this paper that the official standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church are to be found in the Constitution and Canons for the Government of this Church and in the Book of Common Prayer, including the Ordinal and the Articles of Religion as well as the regular services of worship and the Offices of Instruction contained in the body of that book.

Let us begin by examining the actual practice of this Church with respect to the Ministry as provided for by these official standards of government and worship and consider in the second place the theory or doctrine on which this practice is based.

The Constitution of this Church assumes the existence of three orders or ranks of Ministers—Bishops, Presbyters or Priests (the name Presbyter being generally used in respect of polity and the name Priest in liturgical or sacramental contexts), and Deacons. The highest legislative body consists of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies, the latter being made up of Presbyters and Laymen elected by the several dioceses. In addition to recognizing these three orders of Ministers, the Constitution lays down requisites for the ordination of Priests and Deacons and for the ordination and consecration of Bishops. The Canons, or governing laws enacted by the successive General Conventions, set forth the procedures and the conditions which shall be observed in advancing any person to the Diaconate, the Priesthood, or the Episcopate.

While these Canonical regulations have to do chiefly with the ordination of candidates coming out of the lay membership of this particular Church, special provisions are made for those who

have received prior ordination in some other Church. At this point there is a clear distinction observed between those who have received episcopal ordination in another Christian body and those not episcopally ordained. Thus, in accordance with Canon 10, Ministers ordained in Foreign Churches by Bishops in communion with this Church, such as other branches of the Anglican Communion, may be admitted into the Ministry of this Church without further ordination, on condition that they supply the necessary credentials and make the same promises of conformity to our doctrine, discipline, and worship as are required of our own candidates for ordination. Likewise, Ministers ordained by Bishops not in communion with this Church, such as the Roman Catholic Church or one of the Orthodox Churches, may be admitted into our Ministry without further ordination under more rigorous conditions which include a testing of their knowledge of the Polity, History, and the standards of Worship and Doctrine of this Church. But if any minister of another Christian communion which does not practice episcopal ordination desires to transfer to our Ministry he must be made a Deacon and later a Priest in accordance with our Ordinal. In this connection, Canon 11 declares that "At the time of such ordination the Bishop may read this preface to the service: A. B. who has already been ordained a minister of Christ, desiring to be a Deacon or Priest in this Church, has satisfied the Ecclesiastical Authority of this Diocese that he accepts the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of this Church, we are about to confer upon him authority to minister in this Church." And "the letters of ordination in such cases may contain the words: Recognizing the ministry which he has already received and hereby adding to that commission the grace and authority of Holy Orders as required for the exercise of the ministry of this Church."

In addition to these laws governing admission into our Ministry, Canon 23 provides that those who are not Ministers of this Church may not officiate in any congregation within its jurisdiction, though communicants of this Church may be licensed as Lay-Readers, and Bishops may permit Christian men to make addresses in the Church on special occasions.

The Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church thus require that the Ministry of this Church shall consist of Bishops, and of Priests and Deacons episcopally ordained, and that such Ministers alone may officiate in our congregations. These same standards lay down certain of the duties and functions of these three orders. Bishops are the chief executives of the dioceses and the presiding officers of Diocesan Conventions. Together they form the upper house of the General Convention. They are required to reside in their dioceses and to visit the congregations of the diocese at least once in three years to examine their condition, inspect the work of the clergy, administer Confirmation, preach the Word, and, at their discretion, administer the Holy Communion. The regular parish minister, or rector, who must be a Presbyter, has full authority over the worship and pastoral care of the congregation, subject to the Canons, the Prayer Book and the counsel of the Bishop. It is his duty to instruct children in the Catechism, the Doctrine, Polity, History and Liturgy of the Church, and to prepare young persons and others for Confirmation. Deacons are subject to the direction of the Bishop in whose Diocese they were ordained or of the Diocese in which they are canonically resident. A Deacon may not be the rector of a parish or congregation. As has already been noted, male communicants may be licensed by the Bishop as Lay-Readers and in that capacity may conduct Morning and Evening Prayer (omitting the Absolution), the Litany, and the Office for the Burial of the Dead.

These Constitutional and Canonical provisions as to the three orders of Ministers and their several functions are further supplemented and amplified in the Prayer Book. The Ordinal is "the Form of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The Preface to the Ordinal states that "to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form

hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

The three distinct "Forms" for "Making Deacons," "Ordering Priests," and "Ordaining or Consecrating a Bishop," each contains statements which interpret the functions of these several Orders. "It appertaineth to the Office of a Deacon . . . to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof; and to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church; and to instruct the youth in the Catechism; in the absence of the Priest to baptize infants; and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop. And furthermore, it is his Office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the Parish, that they may be relieved with the alms of the Parishioners, or others." The Priest at the time of the laying on of hands is charged to be "a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God and of his holy Sacraments" and pledges himself to "drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word." A Bishop, in addition to the more general injunctions that might apply equally to the other ranks of Ministers, is required to promise that he will be "faithful in Ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others" and "diligently exercise such discipline as by the authority of God's Word and by the order of this Church" is committed to him.

A further exposition of the functions of the three Orders of Ministers is found in the Offices of Instruction. There it is said that "The office of a Bishop is to be a chief pastor in the Church; to confer Holy Orders; and to administer Confirmation." "The office of a Priest is, to administer to the people committed to his care; to preach the Word of God; to baptize; to celebrate the Holy Communion; and to pronounce Absolution and Blessing in God's Name." Finally, "The Office of Deacon is, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and in his other ministrations, under the direction of the Bishop."

In line with this interpretation of the functions of the Ministers of the Church the rubrics of the Prayer Book designate the

Bishop as the Minister of Confirmation and Ordination, the Priest as the Minister of the Lord's Supper and of Absolution and Blessing. Otherwise the Prayer Book rubrics commonly use the general title of "Minister" for the officiant.

The act of ordination in each of the Forms prescribed by the Prayer Book consists of the laying on of hands followed by the delivery into the hands of the ordinand of the New Testament or the Bible. In the case of Deacons the Bishop alone lays his hands upon the head of the candidate, saying "Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee" and on the delivery of the New Testament the Bishop says, "Take thou authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same, if thou be thereto licensed by the Bishop himself." In the case of a Priest's ordination, the Bishop and the Priests present lay their hands on the head of the ordinand and the Bishop says one of two alternative sentences of ordination. One of these corresponds closely to that used for Deacons and reads, "Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the Imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of the holy Sacraments." The other reads, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy Sacraments." On the delivery of the Bible the Bishop says, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."

At the Consecration of a Bishop the presiding Bishop and other Bishops present lay their hands on the head of the Bishop-elect and the presiding Bishop says, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; . . . And remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is given thee

by this Imposition of our hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." When the presiding Bishop then delivers to him the Bible he uses a longer exhortation, bidding the new Bishop "to be to the flock of Christ a shepherd," "so to minister discipline that you forget not mercy," etc.

The service of Holy Communion invariably follows in the case of all ordinations.

It can readily be seen that two somewhat divergent ideas as to the meaning of ordination are reflected in these sentences of ordination. The sentence used for Deacons and the alternative form for Priests stress the giving of authority to perform certain ministerial functions in the Church. The initial sentence for Priests and the one used for Bishops with the Words, "Receive the Holy Ghost, etc.," stress the spiritual gift or grace required for the exercise of the ministry. In the history of Anglicanism the interpretations placed upon these words have varied widely from a precatory to a high sacramental interpretation.

So much for the usage of the Protestant Episcopal Church with respect to the Ministry, as that usage is prescribed by our Constitution, Canons, and Book of Common Prayer. When we go on to ask what theory or doctrine is offered to provide a basis for this practice, the material for our answer is found in the preface to the Ordinal, in the Offices of Instruction, in the Articles of Religion, and indirectly in certain of the prayers.

The Preface to the Ordinal opens with the statement, "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority." Apart from the question as to the truth of this statement and as to whether the three Orders as we now

maintain them correspond with such Orders as may be found in the Church "from the Apostles' time," a question which it is not my task to discuss, it is important to note what is said and what is not said. A purely historical statement is made as to the form taken by the Ministry of the Church. No claim is here presented that these three Orders are of divine institution either in the sense that they were instituted by our Lord or by the direction of the Holy Spirit. No statement is made that the Ministry of the Church *must* forever take this form or that these Orders are by God's revealed will essential for the being or even for the well-being of the Church. Taken by itself the Preface simply says that this Church proposes to maintain the form of Ministry which it believes to have existed "from the Apostles' time."

Among the Articles of Religion there are a number which bear on our theme. Article XIX, "Of the Church," defines the visible Church as "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, . . ." That is, no particular form of Ministry is here set down as belonging to the essence of the Church. Article XXIII, "Of Ministering in the Congregation," declares that "it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And whose we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard." The content of Article XXVI, "Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers which hinders not the effect of Sacraments," is sufficiently indicated by its title. Article XXXVI, "Of the Consecration of Bishops and Ministers," affirms that "The Book of Consecration of Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, as set forth by the General Convention of this Church in 1792, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering; neither hath it any thing that, of itself, is superstitious and ungodly. And, there-

fore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to said Form, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." This plainly claims the propriety and sufficiency of our own forms of ordination. It does not in itself make any statements as to other forms of ordination.

In the Offices of Instruction the question is asked, "What orders of Ministers are there in the Church?" And the answer provided is, "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; which orders have been in the Church from the earliest times."

There are a number of prayers in the Prayer Book which ascribe these Orders to God's providence or to the Holy Spirit. Thus the Collect set forth for use in the Form for Making Deacons begins, "Almighty God, who by thy divine providence hast appointed divers orders of Ministers in thy Church, and didst inspire thine Apostles to choose into the Order of Deacons the first Martyr Saint Stephen, with others, . . ." Likewise the Collect for the Ordering of Priests begins, "Almighty God, . . . who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church; . . ." In the "Office of Institution of Ministers into Parishes or Churches" one of the prayers opens with the following words, "O Holy Jesus, who hast purchased to thyself an universal Church, and hast promised to be with the Ministers of Apostolic Succession to the end of the world: etc." So far as I know this is the one occurrence of the phrase, "Apostolic Succession," in the official standards of this Church. No official interpretation of the phrase is available, though the writer of the prayer presumably had in mind a ministry ordained by bishops whose consecrations linked them continuously with the Apostles.

From these rather fragmentary sources we may conclude that the official standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church imply in some places that a particular form of Ministry is not of the essence of the Church, though a lawfully ordained ministry is necessary; while they certainly claim that our three-fold Orders, episcopally ordained, have marked the Church since Apostolic times, and assert in other places that these Orders are the result of God's providence or the work of the Holy Spirit.

Having considered the material on the Ministry in the standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church I now turn to the comparable statements in the Standards of Doctrine, Government, Discipline, and Worship of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. I do so with considerable diffidence and with apologies for any omissions or misinterpretations in which I may unwittingly involve myself.

The "Form of Government" states that "The ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church are Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled Ruling Elders; and Deacons." While there is a nominal parallel here to the three Orders of the Protestant Episcopal Church in that the names "Bishop," "Elder," and "Deacon" appear in each scheme and the words "Elder" and "Presbyter" were originally equivalents, the differences are really more important than the likenesses. Only the Bishop or Pastor falls within the category of the Ministry as conceived in Episcopal usage. The "Elder" and the "Deacon" are more closely related to our Wardens and Vestrymen, though in Presbyterian usage the Elders have a more responsible part in the spiritualities than do our Wardens and Vestrymen; they occupy a more settled position in general Church government; and both they and the Deacons are given permanent religious and ecclesiastical status by being set apart with prayer.

The differences come out more clearly when we consider the functions assigned to these three offices in the Presbyterian standards. "The pastoral office is first in the Church, both for dignity and usefulness." Various Scriptural terms for the Church's Ministers are interpreted as indicating the several functions of this one office, such as "Bishop" for the function of oversight, "Presbyter" or "Elder" for the function of governing with mature wisdom, "pastor" for the function of spiritual feeding, and "steward of the mysteries of God" for the function of dispensing the grace of God and the ordinances. The "ordinances" which are within the province of the "Bishops or Pastors" are "prayer, singing praises, reading, expounding and preaching the Word of God; administering Baptism and the

Lord's Supper; public solemn fasting and thanksgiving; catechizing, making collections for the poor and other pious purposes; exercising discipline; and blessing the people." These are in general the functions of the "Priest" in the Episcopal Church, though certain of them are also shared by our "Deacons."

The Presbyterian "Ruling Elders" "do not labor in the word and doctrine," but do share in the "government and discipline" with pastors, both in the local congregations and in the higher judicatories of the Church. The Ruling Elders of a congregation, together with the Pastor or Pastors, constitute the "church session," and this body, subject to the provisions of the "Directory of Worship," has exclusive authority over the worship of the congregation and maintains the records of membership, baptisms, marriages, etc. Thus the Ruling Elders participate in certain of the functions exclusively assigned to the Rector or the parish priest in the Episcopal Church as well as performing the duties of our Wardens and Vestry. The Synods and the General Assembly are made up of Pastors or Bishops and of selected Ruling Elders; so the latter occupy a position in the legislative bodies of the Presbyterian Church not paralleled by Episcopal Wardens and Vestrymen.

It is the business of the "Deacons" in a Presbyterian congregation "to take care of the poor and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use." "To them also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the Church." They thus share in one of the functions theoretically assigned to the Order of Deacons in the Episcopal Church, namely the special care of the poor, but their general function is parallel to that of our Vestries.

Certain of the functions exclusively given to Bishops in the Episcopal Church are assigned to the Presbytery in the Presbyterian Church. A presbytery, which consists of all the ministers and one ruling elder from each congregation within a certain district "has power to ordain, install, remove, and judge ministers; to examine and approve or censure the records of church sessions; to resolve questions of doctrine or discipline . . . ; to

visit particular churches, for the purpose of inquiring into their state, . . . and, in general, to order whatever pertains to the spiritual welfare of the churches under their care." These cover broadly the functions of a Bishop within one of our dioceses as exercised in conjunction with the Standing Committee. They do not include anything which corresponds to Confirmation.

As in the case of the Episcopal Church, the ministerial duties in the Presbyterian Church are normally restricted to those who have been regularly ordained. "The Word of God is to be preached only by such as are sufficiently gifted, and also duly approved and called to that office." Neither of the two Sacraments "may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the Word, lawfully ordained." "It is . . . proper that . . . marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister, . . ."

To this general rule restricting ministerial functions to those who have been ordained there are certain exceptions. Vacant congregations, that is those without a minister, are urged to assemble regularly on the Lord's Day for worship, and at such times the elders or deacons are to preside. Probationers, or men who have met certain educational tests and satisfied a Presbytery as to their piety and general qualifications and been licensed, may also conduct public worship and preach the Gospel. They are not permitted to administer Baptism or the Lord's Supper. These Probationers do not correspond to Lay-Readers in the Episcopal Church. They are more nearly parallel to Deacons in our Church, in that their licentiate is a preparatory stage in their progress to the full ministry and in that they are permitted to exercise the ministry of the Word but not that of the Sacraments, but they are not ordained, and therefore do not constitute a distinct "Order" of Ministers.

The Presbyterian standards provide for "ordination" to the three "ordinary and perpetual" offices in the Church as ours provide ordination to the three "Orders" of Ministers, though liturgical forms are, of course, not prescribed. In the case of Ruling Elders and Deacons the act of "ordination" must include a sermon, the answering in the presence of the congregation of

questions as to the candidate's faith and fidelity to the Presbyterian system, an affirmation by the congregation of their acceptance of their new officers, followed by the setting apart of the candidates by a prayer said by the pastor. The ordination of a licentiate or probationer to the pastorate is, if convenient, to take place in the church of which he is to be the minister. A selected member of the ordaining presbytery presides. The service includes a sermon and the interrogation of the candidate and the congregation. After this the candidate shall kneel down in the most convenient part of the church. Then the presiding minister shall, by prayer, and with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, according to the apostolic example, solemnly ordain him to the holy office of the gospel ministry. Then follows the giving of the right hand of fellowship by the members of the presbytery. The service is concluded with a charge to "the newly ordained bishop" and to the people, the singing of a psalm and the blessing.

The Presbyterian Church is much less rigorous than the Episcopal Church in the matter of permitting ministers ordained in other Churches to officiate in their congregations and in the demands made on those who would transfer from another ministry to that of the Presbyterian Church. "Ministers of other denominations in correspondence with this General Assembly may be employed as occasional supplies" in vacant churches. "Ministers connected with other denominations applying for membership in a presbytery, shall submit satisfactory evidence of possessing the qualifications of character and scholarship required of candidates and licentiates in this Church; shall be examined in theology, and at the discretion of the presbytery in other subjects, and shall answer "the same questions addressed to a candidate at his ordination. No further act of setting apart or of ordination is required.

Apart from any doctrinal statements, it seems evident that these differences in law and practice reflect a marked divergence between these two Churches with respect to the importance which is attached to a particular form of ordination.

The doctrinal material in the Presbyterian standards bearing on the Ministry is relatively slight, as is the case in the official documents of the Episcopal Church. In Chapter XXV of the "Confession of Faith" it is stated that to the catholic visible Church "Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto." Again, we read in Chapter XXXIV that the Holy Spirit "calls and anoints ministers for their holy office, and qualifies all other officers in the Church for their special work." The most important statements are found in the opening Chapter of the "Form of Government." There it is affirmed: "That our blessed Saviour, for the edification of the visible Church, which is his body, hath appointed officers, not only to preach the gospel *and administer the Sacraments*; but also to exercise discipline, for the preservation both of truth and duty; and that it is incumbent upon these *officers*, and upon the whole Church, in whose name they act, to censure or cast out the erroneous and scandalous; observing, in *all cases*, the rules contained in the Word of God." "That though the character, qualifications, and authority of church officers, are laid down in the Holy Scriptures, as well as the proper method of their investiture and institution; yet the election of the persons to the exercise of this authority, in any particular society, is in that society."

From these statements, taken in conjunction with the many references to Scriptural texts throughout the standards and with the practice enjoined, I gather that the Presbyterian Church holds that our Lord appointed officers in His Church both for the functions of administering the Word and the Sacraments and for the functions of discipline and government; that the three ranks of Church officers intended by God for His Church are set forth in Scripture as well as the proper method of investing them with authority; that the Presbyterian Church holds that its distinctions of officers and methods of ordaining them are thoroughly Scriptural; but that no particular method of ordination is essential so

long as the Church is assured that its Ministers are pledged to the maintenance of the revealed faith and worship and discipline. It would seem fair to say that the Presbyterian Church approaches the subject of the Ministry more particularly in terms of discipline and government, whereas the Episcopal Church lays the primary stress on the sacramental and liturgical character of the Ministry. In the Presbyterian system the Ministers are subsumed under the category of Church "officers." Their ministerial functions are treated as one aspect, and the most important aspect, of the Church's discipline of its membership in obedience to the law of God. In the Episcopal tradition the threefold Orders of Ministers are primary and the Church's government or polity is subordinated.

THE ANGLICAN DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS

By FREDERICK C. GRANT, Union Theological Seminary

I

In the interest of complete understanding it should be stated at the outset that the Anglican view of the sacraments is two-fold: Catholic in origin and Protestant in interpretation. As used by Anglicans, these two terms, Catholic and Protestant, are not mutually exclusive. In the historic sense, Anglicans *protest* (i.e. affirm) the Catholic faith "as this church hath received the same." The doctrine set forth in the Book of Common Prayer derives historically from the main stream of Catholic tradition, Eastern as well as Western, and presupposes as orthodox and authoritative the teaching of the ancient undivided Church. Instead of appealing to the Bible as against the Creeds and other formulae of the patristic age, the Episcopal Church appeals to both, insisting that while the scripture "contains all things necessary to salvation" (Article 6; *cf.* the Ordinal) the Creeds and other authoritative ancient formulae are not in opposition to scriptural teaching but are in fact derived from scripture, and only elucidate, expound, or summarize it. This view is characteristic not only of the Church of England, from which the Episcopal Church in the United States of America "is far from intending to depart . . . in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require" (Preface to the *Book of Common Prayer*, p. vi); but also, it should be noted, this view is characteristic of the undivided Church itself, which everywhere appealed to scripture as the record of divine revelation and the final court of appeal of any contested doctrine or interpretation. Thus it may even be said that the Protestant note, viz. emphasis upon the final authority of Holy Scripture, characterizes not only the Episcopal or Anglican Church but also the early Catholic or undivided Church through which appeal is made by Anglicans to the same scripture. (The principle is sometimes obscured in

practice and in popular terminology, as when writers or speakers reiterate that "the Church teaches" so-and-so; but what is meant, if the writers or speakers are loyal to the Anglican tradition, is that "the Church teaches" so-and-so upon the basis of the divine revelation contained in Holy Scripture, and in conformity with the mind of God therein declared.)

When it is said, often and truly, that the Anglican Church is "both Catholic and Protestant," what is really meant is not that "the Anglican settlement" or "compromise" represents a synthesis of opposing 16th and 17th century views, a synthesis effected by political sagacity or coercion, but that the Protestant emphasis or interpretation has a respectable lineage and may appeal to antiquity. In brief, the Protestant appeal to scripture as superior to popes and councils, popular practices on one hand and the theologies of schoolmen on the other, is an appeal for which ample warrant may be found in the first age of the church, and is itself essentially "Catholic." This is to say that on the Anglican view there is no necessary conflict between the Catholic principle and the Protestant; as interpreted in the official formularies of the Episcopal Church, the Protestant principle finds its proper place and its complete justification within the wide circle of Catholic teaching. Thus "the Anglican compromise" represents a genuine synthesis, not an artificial or merely *de facto* harmonizing of opposite views. It assumes as possible and legitimate a "Catholic" interpretation of Protestantism which will not only deal fairly with the central emphasis in Protestantism but will also insist upon its recognition as a genuine element in the Catholic tradition itself. Equally it assumes as possible and legitimate the "Protestant" interpretation of Catholicism. It is this appeal from the sixteenth century to the fifth, and from the fifth to the first, from contemporary popes and councils to earlier creeds and traditions and from creed and tradition to the scripture itself, that characterizes the Anglican settlement of the Reformation controversies.

Not only has this solution been effective, in practice, in all Anglican churches for nearly four centuries now; we earnestly believe that it affords a promise and indeed sets forth in principle

what may eventually be possible in the Reunited Church of the future. The Reformation, instead of being abandoned, should be carried through to its full completion—as the Protestant affirmation of genuine Catholicism as against papal perversion and error. On this view the Church is generically and essentially Catholic, and cannot be anything else, as the one, holy, apostolic Church, the creation of God and not of man, endowed and inspired by the divine Spirit, nourished and sustained by divine grace, “the Body of Christ,” “the fulness of Him that filleth all in all”; at the same time the Protestant teaching and emphasis (which Anglicanism equally shares) is seen to be essentially “Catholic” in its main presuppositions. For Protestantism does not represent or advocate any other church than the one, holy, apostolic, historic Church of Christ: both the Catholic and the Protestant emphases equally presuppose the one and only Church of the living God—in the nature of things there can be no other.

It is in the light of this general view of the nature of the Church that the Anglican doctrine of the sacraments must be understood. For the doctrine of the sacraments is likewise generically Catholic, Protestant only in emphasis and interpretation. And we believe that the same is true of Presbyterian doctrine: in origin, in history and in formal definition, the doctrine of the sacraments as set forth in Presbyterian formularies equally presupposes the unity and uniqueness of the Church, the final authority of Holy Scripture, the mediation of divine grace as the indispensable and essential factor in all sacramental ministration, the real presence of Christ in his Church, and the effectual operation of the Holy Spirit in and through the sacraments—for without the divine ordinance or apart from the divine operation the sacraments would on this view be empty and all but meaningless. Perhaps the language which Anglicans traditionally use of the sacraments is not quite the same as that used by Presbyterians; but the central emphasis and intention we believe to be the same.

Some of our difficulties, within the Anglican fold, come from a difference of historical perspective in using the formal language of the Prayer Book; and some arise from a one-sided emphasis

upon either the Catholic or the Protestant element in our tradition, viewed as alternative rather than as complementary or mutually inclusive. For some persons, "Catholic" implies Roman, and therefore false, heretical, corrupt; on the other hand, even with the best intentions, an unconscious bias predisposes others to take as their standard of reference the numerically superior representation of Catholicism to be seen in Rome; and for some persons, similarly, the word "Protestant" bears an implication of irreverence, skepticism, or a careless disregard of the divinely appointed means of grace. As against both sets of prejudices, the only fair procedure is to take the language of official formulae, of formal declarations, in their plain historic meaning, and then to interpret this language in the light of the whole body of the Church's teaching, rather than as isolated statements which may or may not require the whole body of doctrine for their elucidation. We think this to be the only fair method: for certainly the doctrine of sacraments cannot be understood apart from such other doctrines as God's creation of the world, the Incarnation of Christ, the Redemption, the possibility and the effectiveness of prayer, the inspiration of scripture, the reality of divine grace. And what we assume as indispensable for an understanding of Anglican doctrine must equally be assumed for an understanding of Presbyterian: that is, it is related to the whole body of doctrine which the Church teaches. Otherwise the doctrine of sacraments may easily be misconstrued, with the result that they are treated either as magic rites or as merely symbolic ceremonies: whereas, according to Anglican teaching, a sacrament in truth is what it *represents*, conveys in reality what it symbolizes, and yet is no mechanical device operating independently of divine or human intention, or apart from repentance, faith, and obedience to the will of God. As Hooker stated it (*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 57. 4):

"Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose, moral instruments, the use whereof is in our hands, the effect in His; for the use we have His express commandment, for the effect His conditional promise: so that . . . we are not to doubt but that they really give what they promise, and are

what they signify. For we take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblance* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify." (Cf. More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, pp. 408f.)

II

The classic and authoritative definition of a sacrament is that contained in the Catechism and the Second Office of Instruction:

"I mean by this word Sacrament an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive this grace, and a pledge to assure us thereof" (B. C. P., p. 292: cf. 581).

Upon this definition, there are "two sacraments only" which (1) "Christ hath ordained in his church" (2) "as generally necessary to salvation," viz. Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Of the other so-called sacraments or sacramental rites, it cannot be said without question that Christ ordained them, nor that they are "generally" necessary to salvation: *e.g.* Holy Matrimony, which was neither "ordained" by Christ, nor can it be thought "necessary to salvation" and therefore to be "generally" required, *i.e.* of all Christians.

This temperate and restrained language of the Catechism (the section dates from 1604) is in strong contrast to the somewhat unfortunate language of Article 25 (which comes from an earlier generation, from a time of violent disputation, 1571). Here

"those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."

The language of the Article is extreme; and yet the facts it emphasizes will scarcely be questioned by anyone familiar with the history of sacramental doctrine and practice. The contrast

between the mediaeval doctrine and practice of penance, for example, with its clustering abuses, and the New Testament doctrine and practice of repentance, confession, and forgiveness, is perfectly obvious: though the phrase, "the corrupt following of the Apostles," is scarcely one which either an impartial historian or a devout son of the Church would be likely to use. The central emphasis of both the Catechism (or the Second Office of Instruction) and Article 25 is the same, despite difference in language; it is the superiority of Baptism and the Lord's Supper over all other "so-called sacraments," and the reality of the grace "effectually" signified by them.¹

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and *effectual signs* of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him" (Art. 25, ad. init.).

Such language, ill-chosen as some of it undoubtedly is, loose and untechnical and untheological and too greatly influenced by contemporary controversy as it is, is nevertheless certainly "patient of a Catholic interpretation," as Newman recognized, and at the same time clings firmly to scripture, as scripture was understood and interpreted in the 16th century. Sacramental grace is something definitely and specifically connected with the sacraments, and conveyed by them: this is the only legitimate historical interpretation of the phrase, "effectual signs." It is not dependent upon the worthiness or moral character of the minister (Article 26)—though the scandal of ministerial unworthiness is a great hindrance to edification. At the same time unworthy reception is dangerous to the recipient: "The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith," although they receive in a physical sense "the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in

¹ Canon Quick is certainly correct in his statement: "The general usage of Anglicanism . . . has not thus strictly confined the use of the word [sacrament]; and at the present time it is impossible to say that there is any definite number of Christian rites to which alone the name Sacrament is recognized as applicable by Anglicans."—O. C. Quick, in *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, ed. by A. C. Headlam and R. Dunkerley, Macmillan, 1937, p. 125.

no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing" (Art. 29; *cf.* 25, *ad fin.*).

It is this principle of "effectual signs" (*efficacia signa*) which underlies the Articles on Baptism and the Lord's Supper:

XXVII. *Of Baptism.* Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or New-Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

XXVIII. *Of the Lord's Supper.* The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

Two other Articles deal with the Lord's Supper:

XXX. *Of both Kinds.* The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

XXXI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.* The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. [Compare the language of the Canon of the Holy Communion, B.C.P., p. 80.] Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

It is a relief, to many persons, to turn from the Articles, with their sharp echoes of far-off, half-forgotten controversies, to the

Offices of Instruction, with their calm statement of religious truth for purposes of religious instruction and preparation for the reception of these blessed ordinances. The theme of the section dealing with the sacraments (B. C. P., pp. 292f.) is the classic definition quoted above. As we saw, the Anglican definition recognizes two parts to each sacrament: the outward and visible, and the inward and spiritual (where Roman theology recognizes four parts: *res, virtus, forma, materia*). In *Baptism*, the outward and visible sign or form is water, wherein the person is baptized in the name of the Blessed Trinity; while the inward and spiritual grace in Baptism is "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; whereby we are made the children of grace." Two things are required of those who are to be baptized: "Repentance; whereby they forsake sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God to them in that Sacrament." Infants are baptized, in spite of their inability to exercise either repentance or faith, "because, by the faith of their Sponsors, infants are received into Christ's Church, become the recipients of his grace, and are trained in the household of faith."

The Sacrament of *the Lord's Supper*, which was ordained "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby," has likewise two parts: the outward part or sign being "Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received," and the inward part, or thing signified, being "the Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful." "The benefits whereof we are partakers in the Lord's Supper are the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the Bread and Wine." Finally, "it is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper to examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, with stedfast purpose to lead a new life; to have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death; and to be in charity with all men." (*Cf.* the Invitation at Holy Communion: "Ye who do truly . . ." B. C. P., p. 75.)

III

The language of the Book of Common Prayer, both of the Articles and of the Catechism (upon which the Offices of Instruction, added in 1928, are based), is language which reflects the standpoint of the Anglican Reformation. It has been described as the language of compromise, of mediation, of comprehension or inclusion, and as aiming at once to say Yes and No—or at least to say, "Yes, but . . ." or "No, but . . ."—to be both Catholic and Protestant, Calvinist, Lutheran, Puritan, and yet Catholic in the sense of the early and undivided Church.

Such criticism, while in a measure historically correct, goes only part of the way in making clear the real standpoint of Anglicanism. For the language of the Prayer Book is also the language of continuity, as well as of comprehension and compromise; it aims to preserve as much as possible of the treasure accumulated in and received from the past; and it is also language that is thoroughly biblical, in intention, in thought, and often in expression. Occupying the central position which the Anglican Church held during the Reformation, in spite of successive efforts to move it either to the right or to the left—or, sometimes, both ways at once—it is natural that the Church's official language should be capable of various interpretations, as by "high," "low," "evangelical," "liberal," or "catholic" churchmen. Rather than view this as a demerit, we rejoice that it is so. And, as already noted, we believe that this principle contains a promise of the eventual reunion of the whole Christian Church, upon a basis of inclusion and "comprehension" rather than the triumph of one sect, group, denomination, or theological emphasis over all others. Instead of merely reflecting the successive political exigencies of the Tudor and Stuart eras in England, we believe that the principle is fundamental to any genuinely "Catholic" conception of the Christian Church. There must be unity in essentials; there must be continuity with the past—for Christianity is the religion of a historic divine revelation; there must be adaptation to changing human needs; there must be room for variety, and even for

divergence, in theological interpretation and emphasis.² Unity does not mean identity, or even uniformity; nor is uniformity the method by which unity is to be achieved. Unity in diversity is the Anglican ideal: "In essentials unity; in non-essentials liberty; in all things charity." And this we believe to be not only the Anglican ideal but also the ideal of genuine Catholicity, and of any practicable ecumenical realization of the Church's life in this divergent, polymorphous, very human world in which it is to exist and function.

At the same time, as we have noted, the language of the Book of Common Prayer is thoroughly *biblical*. I should like now to offer a few notes upon this feature of the Anglican Doctrine of the Sacraments.

1. It is undeniable that *Baptism* was the normal "rite of initiation" in the early church, almost if not quite from the very beginning of the Christian movement: the New Testament in all its parts reflects the practice as already accepted and of long and unquestioned standing. Its antecedents, as among others the late Professor Frank Gavin pointed out,³ were two-fold, and were in both respects thoroughly Jewish: "The baptism" of John (which the early source followed in Acts 10:37—cf. 1:22—represents as "the beginning" of the Christian movement), and the baptism of proselytes in the Jewish diaspora. Thus both Palestinian and extra-Palestinian Judaism contributed to provide its antecedents. Indeed, as the latest researches show, John's baptism was probably itself based upon current Jewish practice, rather than upon an importation from some extraneous cult or other then current in the surrounding Near-eastern world. Two generations ago there were scholars who saw in John an Essene preacher and baptizer; but we really do not know enough about

² See the article, "The Significance of Divergence and Growth in the New Testament," *Christendom*, iv. 4, Autumn 1939, pp. 575-587.

³ Frank Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, S.P.C.K., 1928, ch. ii. See also J. Jeremias, *Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt?* Göttingen, 1938; A. Oepke, art. *Baptô*, *Baptizô*, etc., in G. Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.*, vol. I, Stuttgart, 1933.

Essene baptism to make such a statement; and where "normal" Jewish antecedents are at hand it seems unnecessary to go farther afield in search of an explanation. The distinctive feature of John's baptism was that he required of born Jews what the Synagogue normally required only of gentile converts. And the movement which he inaugurated, "The Baptism" as the Book of Acts calls it, was so widespread that it not only reached the far corners of the Jewish land but spread abroad into distant centers wherever Jews and proselytes were to be found—as a later passage in the Book of Acts (19:1-7) and the first chapter of the Gospel of John may both be said to prove (e.g. for Ephesus). The Christian Church fell heir to this practice, both in its Johannine and in its normal Jewish form: "fell heir"—or rather, simply took over and continued, as the Church grew up within the borders of Judaism, as the "New" or "True" Israel of God, the Church of the New Covenant *within* the Church of the Old. And this makes it the more likely that Baptism was never "adopted" at some point or other in the development of early Christianity, say as a substitute for, or as a ratification of, the Baptism of the Spirit. Johannes Weiss's question⁴ is thus to be answered as follows: The Church simply carried on the normal mode of the reception of converts to Judaism. Whether or not the three thousand in the Book of Acts (2:41) were all "baptized" may be a question;⁵ but it can scarcely be doubted that the admission of converts, certainly of gentile converts, was by baptism, from the very first. Jews, whether Christian or non-Christian, would not think it conceivable that any other mode of admission was possible: even when the charismatic gift of the Spirit came first, it was taken as evidence that baptism should be no longer delayed (Acts 10:44-48).

⁴ As to the date when Baptism was adopted by the church; see *The History of Primitive Christianity* (Eng. tr. of *Urchristentum*), i. 51.

⁵ As, similarly, Tertullian raised the question regarding the baptism of the Apostles (*De Bapt.* 12; cf. Rawlinson in Headlam and Dunkerley, op. c., p. 294). Presumably they—or at least most of them—had received "the baptism of John," if we may trust the tradition (?) reflected in the opening chapters of the Fourth Gospel. Cf. M. Goguel, *Au Seuil de l'Évangile*, Paris, 1928, pp. 292, etc.

Much has been made of the hypothesis that originally baptism was "in (or *into*) the name of the Lord Jesus" (e.g. Acts 2:38, 8:16, 10:48, 19:5), as if it were a formula, and therefore stood in sharp contrast to the later baptism in the name of the Trinity (Matt. 28:19). But it is a question if, at least in the Aramaic-speaking primitive community in Palestine, either *b'sh'ma* or *l'sh'ma* can have been a *formula*. It was descriptive of the act, and stated its purpose, as—briefly—Christian baptism, in distinction from Johannine or any other, e.g. the baptism of proselytes to Judaism. Baptism "unto Moses" (εἰς τὸν Μ., 1 Cor. 10:2) can scarcely have been a formula; it was only a phrase indicating the purpose—or the result—of an act. What formula was used, in the earliest church, we cannot say; perhaps the intention of the act was clear enough without any formula.⁶

Nor need the Trinitarian language of Matt. 28:19 be viewed as a formula, and therefore an interpolation into the text of our first Gospel. As the late Professor George Foot Moore observed, in his great work on Judaism (i. 188), the language is perfectly good Hellenistic Jewish-Christian language, and does not presuppose the later Athanasian theology. "The Father" is the name of God on Christian lips—and also on Jewish, especially in the synagogue liturgy. "The Son" is an early title of the Messiah, the Lord of the Christian community. "The Holy Spirit" is the out-poured, continually present Power through which God manifested his purpose and his favor to the community. On this interpretation, there is certainly little reason to question the text of the Gospel of Matthew as it stands: for there

⁶ Indeed, it is not impossible, since baptism was probably self-administered (cf. C. R. Bowen, *Studies in the New Testament*, Chicago, 1936, pp. 35-46), that εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ simply described the purpose for which the act was performed, viz., in token that those who "received" this baptism were henceforth to share in the movement and the faith which Jesus represented and taught: "faith" of course involving "works," i.e. the "way" taught by him. Compare Acts 3:6, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk" = "As representing (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι) Jesus Christ of Nazareth [I bid you] walk." Acts 19:3, "Into what (εἰς τί) then were ye baptized? . . . Into John's baptism." See also the art. βάπτω, etc., in Kittel's *Theol. Wörterbuch*, i. 527ff., and S. New [Lake], *Additional Note 11 in Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. V.

is no really important evidence for viewing the verse—or the passage—as an interpolation.

Another corollary to the present-day view of the Jewish origin of baptism is the strong probability that it was administered to children, certainly to children of converts. The "household of Stephanas" (1 Cor. 1:16) probably included children; but even more cogent is the argument from Jewish practice—a woman proselyte's child need not be baptized if the mother was baptized before the child's birth; otherwise the child too must be baptized.⁷

A final question relates to the dominical institution, presupposed alike by the Baptismal Office, the Catechism, and the Articles of Religion. Many scholars of the present day would seriously question this, partly on the basis of the Gospel of John (though 4:2 may be a redactor's gloss), partly on the basis of the post-resurrection dating of the institution in Matthew 28:16–20. Other passages are suspected of containing later glosses (e.g. John 3:5 "water and"; so Moffatt, Bacon, Lake, and Wendt). But even so, the emphatic statements of the Book of Common Prayer, "ordained by Christ himself" (p. 292), "ordained of God" (Art. 25), statements which were perfectly legitimate according to sixteenth century exegesis, do not lose their relevance. For it is clear that the New Testament as a whole emphasizes the two "major" sacraments in a way that it does not emphasize the "lesser" or "so-called" sacraments—and this was the chief point of the reference to dominical institution in the Articles and Catechism. Indeed, some of the "lesser" sacraments can scarcely appeal to the New Testament at all—despite the traditional exegesis, and even with such acute argumentation as the Latin schoolmen used. Moreover, upon the modern view, the New Testament itself does not limit the historical activity of Christ to the period of his earthly ministry. What he ordained "through the Spirit," as the spiritual Lord and Head of his Church, was equally as important as his deeds and utterances in Galilee and Jerusalem

⁷ "If a Gentile [woman] becomes a proselyte during pregnancy, her child need not be baptized" B. Yeb. 78a; J. Jeremias, *Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt*, Göttingen, 1938, p. 13.

in the days before his entrance into his glory.⁸ Primitive Christianity is a "Pneumatic," Spirit-guided, Spirit-controlled religion. Its history—and its "historicity"—are not limited to bare external events, but include the whole spiritual movement inaugurated by Jesus, indeed inaugurated by John (as forerunner), and moving steadily onward toward the Consummation, the Kingdom of God, in the immediate future. It is controlled from within and from above; the risen, glorified Lord is both at the right hand of God and present in the midst of his followers. To ignore this feature is to miss the whole point of the spiritual realism of primitive Christianity, and to ask questions that cannot be answered except in terms of that spiritual realism. This is undoubtedly true, we believe, of the origins of the ministry; it is equally true of the origins of the sacraments. There were probably some who found this a difficult conception—as there are some today who cannot receive it; they tended to think in terms of a "historical" institution of the sacraments, the specific promulgation of the New Law at a point in time and upon a mountain in Galilee, and of a "founding" of the Church at a specific hour—Pentecost, or the Resurrection, or the Crucifixion, or Peter's Confession near Caesarea Philippi, or even perhaps the Baptism or the Birth of Jesus. But they were doomed by such predispositions to ask questions which the New Testament does not answer. The Church "grew out of" Judaism, rather than resulted from the "founding" of a new religion; the "teaching" of the Church "grew out of" Jesus' sayings and discourses, and the teachings of the Old Testament and of Judaism which they presupposed; the ministry and the sacraments "grew out of" the new life of the Church, guided by the Holy Spirit and controlled by the invisible but ever-present, glorified Lord. This is no aberration of modern scholarship, a hypothesis (like "consistent" eschatology, for example) which must be "applied," i.e. forced upon the text; all that present-day scholarship does is recognize what is perfectly clear in the New Testament itself. It was not generally

⁸ See the article, "The Spiritual Christ," in *Jour. Bibl. Lit.*, liv. 1 (Mar. 1935); or cc. ii-iii in my *Frontiers of Christian Thinking*, Chicago, 1935.

recognized in former centuries for the simple reason that the Latin mind, which dominated theology and exegesis in the West for sixteen centuries (from Tertullian to the 19th century), had a pattern of thought for all institutions, civil and religious, which required their specific institution, inauguration, promulgation, and establishment as law. What modern scholarship does, first of all, is simply recognize that the Church began in an era and in a milieu where western and Roman conceptions of legislative establishment were not recognized; and in a situation where the will of the Risen Lord, declared through the Spirit, was at least equally valid with specific historical institution—as valid, e.g., as the ordinances of God through Moses, regarding the tabernacle and the sacrifices.

2. This principle is of the very greatest importance when we consider the origins of the *Holy Eucharist*. A great many, perhaps the majority of present-day scholars, accept the view of Professor Hans Lietzmann that the Eucharist goes back to a dual origin; that at least from the very earliest period it was found in two different types—though which of the two was the original is still a subject of debate.⁹ One type of Eucharistic liturgy presupposes the memorial rite of the Jerusalem (or Palestinian) Church, a continuation of the Last Supper, and indeed of the common meal of Jesus with his disciples frequently observed during his public ministry; the other goes back to the celebration of the Supper in the Pauline churches, where the purpose was “to show forth (or proclaim) the Lord’s death till he come” (1 Cor.

⁹ Hans Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn, 1926; A. B. Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church*, Edinburgh, 1934; F. L. Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist*, S.P.C.K., 1939; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford, 1925; J. W. Hunkin, *The Earliest Christian Church*, ch. vi, Cambridge, 1929; A. D. Nock, “Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background,” pp. 120–136, in A. E. J. Rawlinson (ed.), *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, London, 1928; E. L. Parsons and B. H. Jones, *The American Prayer Book*, pp. 152ff., New York, 1937; A. E. J. Rawlinson, “Church, Baptism, and Eucharist,” pp. 298–305, in A. C. Headlam and R. Dunkerley, *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, New York, 1937; R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, tr. F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf, Grand Rapids, 1938, esp. pp. 277ff.

11:26). All later Christian liturgies, and all Eucharistic theologies, derive from one or other of these types or from a combination of the two (plus many later additions and interpretations, more or less consonant with the two primitive types). It is from the "common meal" type that the *agápê* was derived; or rather, that is to say, the "Lord's Supper" was a part of the Common Meal of the Christian group, and was only gradually and after two or three generations completely severed from it. At the same time, the Pauline type grew out of the "Supper" associated with the Common Meal, by interpretation and emphasis and under the influence, not so much of "mystery religions"—which were probably not widely prevalent in the first century—as of Paul's theology,¹⁰ in turn based upon the most primitive Christian beliefs but emphasizing elements in them which were destined henceforth to be of revolutionary effect upon Christian doctrine generally. The Roman Mass, e.g., is sacrificial through and through—and was so apparently from its origin. On the other hand, the Eastern liturgies, like the early fragment preserved in the *Didache*, are celebrations of the Great Thanksgiving, *Eucharistia*, for Christ's Resurrection from the dead, for the new life which is found and received in him: Pauline elements, and pre-Pauline, but emphasized far more fully in the East than in the West. On the whole, the Anglican liturgy is essentially a Eucharist, not a Mass—though the Latin influence, and the Lutheran, are apparent on every page.¹¹ (It is interesting to note that Calvin approved the English liturgy, as Jeremy Taylor assures us. Though he would have preferred a more drastic revision of the old service, "even its vanities were tolerable." See More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, p. 171.)

The point I wish to make is that, in the light of liturgical history, the Anglican rite is (1) thoroughly and conservatively biblical, indeed in some respects even pre-Pauline (if we accept

¹⁰ Or of Paul's own religious experience: the command, "This do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:24f), may have come to Paul, as some scholars hold, "by revelation."

¹¹ See the article, "Mass or Holy Communion," in *Angl. Theol. Rev.*, xv (1933), 27-38.

Lietzmann's hypothesis), and that it is (2) closer to the main stream of Christian (or Catholic) liturgical tradition than any other Western rite, including the Roman: for it lays far more emphasis upon the purely Eucharistic (or "Thanksgiving") element, thus counterbalancing the sacrificial, than do the Roman and other rites more closely related to the Roman. What modern biblical scholarship contributes toward an understanding of the Eucharist is chiefly the recognition of its fundamentally Jewish (i.e. Christian Jewish) origin and earliest connotations. It had, undoubtedly, an "eschatological" or "messianic" connotation from the first. "The meal was at once a religious fellowship in the present, and an anticipation and spiritual foretaste of the blessed reunion hereafter in the greater fellowship-feast of the future Kingdom of God."¹² And yet it was more than an anticipation of the future: Christ the "Lord" of his community was present in its midst. "*Marana thá!*" is perhaps the oldest liturgical phrase in Christian history: an Aramaic phrase, which was so familiar it was not even translated into Greek in the New Testament (1 Cor. 16:22—though it is paraphrased in the Apocalypse of John 22:20, "Amen: Come, Lord Jesus!"). "And because, in a spiritual sense, the Lord already 'came' and was present—because, in a certain sense, there was already an 'Epiphany' of the risen Lord, though unseen, in the midst of His own—there was raised also the answering 'Hosanna!' to meet the Lord at His coming."¹³

It must be apparent at once that, if this interpretation of the most recent biblical scholarship is to be accepted (and I for one do not question its essential accuracy) then the hypothesis popular a generation ago, viz. that the sacramental development within the early church was purely Pauline, and reflected the influence upon Paul of the current pagan "mystery religions," is both completely unnecessary and positively untenable. Sacramental *practice*, not to say sacramental doctrine, characterized primitive Chris-

¹² Bp. Rawlinson, in Headlam and Dunkerley, *op. cit.*, p. 299; compare the Jewish Passover prayers in use to this day (e.g. in Routledge's edition of *Services of the Synagogue*, Passover volume).

¹³ Rawlinson, *l.c.*

tianity from the start.¹⁴ It may be impossible, as yet, to settle the question whether or not the Eucharist arose out of the Jewish Benediction at Meals (the so-called *Kiddush*) rather than the Passover ritual (I personally believe that it did); and also whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover meal (I personally hold, in spite of ably-presented and strong evidence to the contrary, that it was not a Passover meal);¹⁵ nevertheless the whole *ethos* of the rite, even in its earliest stage of development, was both "eschatological" and impressed with the spirit and outlook of the Jewish Passover. Such associations of course strongly affected its earliest interpretation—as we may see from Paul; the influence was undoubtedly at work before the time of Paul.¹⁶

In its strong biblical emphasis, accordingly, and also in its pre-Tridentine, pre-Scholastic refusal to "define the indefinable" (as in its rejection of the theory of Transubstantiation and of the practices which went with it), the Anglican liturgy—and indeed the Prayer Book as a whole—is in accord with modern scholarship. This may not commend it, in the eyes of some persons, even of some Anglicans; nevertheless it is a reassurance to those of us who take biblical scholarship seriously, and view the task of the ecclesiastical or biblical scholar as something sacred—nothing less, in fact, than one function of our priesthood. Moreover it is interesting, historically, that there was a time when even Roman scholars recognized the great merits of the Anglican liturgy—there are, I believe, also some at the present day who share the view; and that there was a time when it was said that the Pope himself stood ready to recognize the rite, provided the Anglican Church were to submit once more to the papal obedience.¹⁷

¹⁴ J. Weiss, *History of Primitive Christianity*, i. 61, etc.; A. D. Nock, op. cit., pp. 136ff; S. New [Lake], op. cit., esp. p. 131.

¹⁵ Esp. in J. Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen, 1935; and in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar z. N. T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, vol. iv, excursus 4.

¹⁶ Though 1 Cor. 5:7-8 may not, in fact, represent Eucharistic theology; cf. J. W. Hunkin, op. cit., p. 67, note 2.

¹⁷ Paul IV and Pius IV; see More and Cross, op. cit., p. 173. But the statement has been disputed.

IV

As to the five "so-called sacraments," the necessity of *Confirmation* is bound up with the view that Confirmation is really the completion of Baptism: and since Baptism, the sacrament of initiation or admission to the Church, is "the most necessary of all sacraments,"¹⁸ it is required of all who "are come to a competent age" (B. C. P., p. 295). This, rather than the desire to fence off the Communion, is the motive behind the rubric on page 299: "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." In its origin, that mediaeval rule was meant only to prevent administering the Communion to infants; but it has been retained down to the present because, among other reasons, it is felt that Confirmation, by which special gifts of the Holy Spirit are conferred, is the indispensable completion of Baptism. There is some confusion and overlapping here; for Holy Baptism, especially in its effect of spiritual regeneration, surely involves the activity of God the Holy Spirit. But such obscurity or absence of full and consistent definition is characteristic of a theology for which scripture and experience both come before clear-cut logic and theoretical consistency.

The minister of Confirmation is the bishop, though Anglicans have repeatedly shown their willingness to consider the proposal of administration by presbyters. If Confirmation be the completion of Baptism, as probably the majority of Anglicans hold, there is added weight on this side. The example of the Eastern Orthodox Church is another consideration. But in practice, and especially in view both of further information now available regarding the origins of episcopacy, and of the relatively much larger number of bishops in the Church at the present day, and likewise the closer relations between modern bishops and their dioceses, it is unlikely that the proposal will be acted upon.

The biblical antecedents of Confirmation are obviously the "laying on of hands" (e.g. Acts 8:17), a practice followed in a variety of connections.

¹⁸ Canon Quick, in Headlam and Dunkerley, *op. cit.*, p. 127.

Penance is the traditional term used of priestly absolution following "auricular" confession; but its connotations are wider still. For it involves not only the reconciliation of penitents but also in certain cases the discipline of offending members—though rare, the withholding of absolution is a very serious exercise of discipline for those who make a practice of confession. It also includes the absolutions in the Holy Communion, the Visitation of the Sick, the Communion of the Sick, and even in Morning and Evening Prayer. Though a distinction is sometimes drawn between the absolution in the Holy Communion and those in Morning and Evening Prayer, there seem to be no grounds, historical or theological, upon which the distinction can be maintained; and the general tendency of present-day Anglicanism is certainly in the direction of greater inclusiveness. As someone has said, "There are probably nearer seventy sacraments than seven." And reference is often made to pre-Scholastic usage, according to which many more than seven rites or acts were so designated.

In theory, the reconciliation of the penitent is the act of the whole Church: the Church itself must receive back the offending member, if he is to be received at all; and the priest is only the functional representative of the Church in administering Penance. It is as representing the Church, the Divine Society whose holiness has been violated by the sinner, that the priest pronounces the absolution. This is not at all the doctrine as sometimes misrepresented, viz. that the priest *qua* priest represents God (*apart* from the Church), or stands as an intermediary between God and the individual (*apart* from the Church). The majority of Anglicans undoubtedly believe absolution to possess a sacramental quality in some degree; though not many, even among extremists, would go the length of placing it on a par with Baptism and Holy Communion (which would be contrary, of course, to the Articles of Religion).

The biblical antecedents include more than a verse or two of the Fourth Gospel (20:23). The whole judicial practice of the Pauline churches (reflected, e.g., in 1 Corinthians), based upon that of the Jewish Synagogue, is involved.

Holy Orders is certainly looked upon as sacramental, by most Anglicans; the grace conveyed by the laying on of hands is no vague "blessing upon the ministry" of the candidate for ordination, but is in a real sense constitutive: he is not a minister without it. The language is most explicit, as in the ordering of Priests: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our Hands . . ." (B. C. P., p. 546).

Once more, however, the underlying conception is functional:¹⁹ it is no magic rite, by which anyone could be made a priest regardless of intention, age, place, preparation, or other prerequisites. It is the solemn setting apart of Christian men to be officers in and servants of the Church, the Body of Christ, and their equipment with special gifts of the Holy Spirit for the faithful fulfillment of their office. As such, there can be no question of the sacramental nature of the ordination rite; though, again, it is "not generally necessary to salvation," i.e. to be required of all Christians.

Holy Matrimony is variously understood; the implied teaching of the Prayer Book is that the man and woman "are joined" by the Church, in the presence of God and in the face of the congregation (Preface, B. C. P., p. 300), i.e. by the Church as representing God (*cf.* p. 303 *fin.*, "Those whom *God* hath joined together"). At the same time, the words of betrothal are equally explicit: "I *N* take thee *M* With this ring I thee wed. . . ." That is, the man and the woman marry each other, in the presence of God and in the midst of the assembled Church. The sacramental element, then, consists in the Church's blessing upon the marriage which has just taken place (pp. 303, 304). Many Anglican theologians accordingly take the view that the two parties to the marriage, i.e. the bride and the groom, are themselves the "ministers" in the marriage; and that the sacramental element is limited to the added blessing, pronounced by the clergyman.

¹⁹ See A. Dun, "What is a Sacrament?" in *Christendom*, iv. 4 (Autumn 1939), esp. p. 509: "A sacrament is an act of the church in her character as the 'Body of Christ,' in which the action of God in Christ towards men is carried on and man responds by making himself party to this divine action."

This view is not universally held in Anglicanism, however. Many agree with Thomas Aquinas that the Church's blessing does not belong to the essence of the Marriage Sacrament²⁰ but only to its "solemnization." As it was stated in the recently proposed revision of Canon 41, "Any valid marriage between Christians is a Christian marriage" (I. 1). Most Anglicans certainly look upon Holy Matrimony as "sacramental marriage"; but it is characteristic of Anglican theology that instead of saying, "The sacramental element must reside either in the vows or in the blessing, and if in one then not in the other," we prefer to say, "Perhaps in both, or in the rite as a whole—for we cannot limit or prescribe in advance the ways in which sacramental grace is received. God is self-bound to His promises, being the God of truth; but He is not bound by them, as if hampered and limited to one and only one way of giving His blessing."

The *Unction of the Sick* was added to the Book of Common Prayer in 1928 (p. 320) as an expression of "the ministry of healing." This is quite frankly a different conception from that of "Extreme Unction" (i.e. of the dying) which is rejected in Article 25. "When any sick person shall in humble faith desire the ministry of healing through Anointing or Laying on of Hands, the Minister may use such portion of the foregoing Office [Visitation of the Sick] as he shall think fit, and the following:

"O Blessed Redeemer, relieve, we beseech thee, by thy indwelling power, the distress of this thy servant; release him from sin, and drive away all pain of soul and body, that being restored to soundness of health, he may offer thee praise and thanksgiving; who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God, world without end. Amen.

"I anoint thee with oil (*or* I lay my hand upon thee), In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; beseeching the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all thy pain and sickness of body being put to flight, the blessing of health may be restored unto thee. Amen."

It is clear that no claim is made for the sacramental nature of this rite. The only test is its fruits. It may or may not prove efficacious. (Contrast the Baptismal rite, p. 280: "Seeing now that this child is regenerate"; or the Communion, pp. 82f.: "The

²⁰ Cf. F. Heiler in Headlam and Dunkerley, p. 435.

Body . . . the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.") God is present, and His blessing is available; and yet there is no unequivocal guarantee that the result will be physical health: that depends upon two factors—the will of God and the faith of the sick person. Such a pragmatic view may not satisfy the demands of a rigid systematic theology; but the rite may help—and that is all that is claimed for it. It is little more than a dramatization of Prayers for the Sick, as indeed the practice reflected in James 5:14 and Mark 6:13 probably was.

V

It is this emphasis upon the sufficiency of scripture, without insistence upon later theological or metaphysical definitions, and the recognition that the mysteries of God are to be thankfully acknowledged and lived by, rather than curiously inquired into, that characterizes the whole sacramental outlook of the Anglican Communion. Let me close with some words that could not be improved—a quotation from the late Paul Elmer More. The passage occurs near the end (p. xxxvii) of the brilliant essay on "The Spirit of Anglicanism" which he wrote for the anthology of Caroline divinity which he and Dr. F. L. Cross edited under the title, *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (Morehouse, 1935).

"Why God should choose this special channel of sacramental grace we know not, any more than we know why His eternal purpose for the redemption of mankind should have necessitated the awful fact of the Incarnation; how the sacrament works we know not any more than we know how the death of His Son is made the instrument of eternal life. In such matters we are brought face to face with the causes and operation of Providence which reach up into the vast, transcendental, all-surrounding circle of the supernatural. But we do know by experience what faith and practice effect in our own souls. Here is not a reckoning of probabilities, but an immediate impress of reality growing ever from less to more distinctness; and, perceiving that the eucharistic elements do so operate, we believe in a supernatural power imparted to them.

"This is the pragmatic argument from effect to cause which permeates the theology of Anglicanism. Not only in the seventeenth century but from the

time of Henry VIII to the present day, if there is any outstanding note of the English temper it is a humility of awe before the divine mysteries of faith and a recognition of the incompetence of language to define the ultimate paradox of experience. It is a pragmatism not of the lips only, as with the scholastics of the past or the present, but from a deep conviction that the rationalization of the supernatural is always in danger of pushing on to a formula which magnifies one half of the truth to an Absolute by excluding the other half. As Cudworth, one of the most metaphysical of the Caroline theologians, expressed it, 'neither are we able to inclose in words and letters the life, soul, and essence of any spiritual truth, and as it were to incorporate it in them.'

"It is not fanciful to say that in the Anglican writers of the seventeenth century we find the Chalcedon of eucharistic theology. The perils alike of transubstantiation and receptionism are avoided: the one because it implies a docetic view of the divine operation in the Eucharist utterly inconsistent with that operation in the sacramental processes considered as a whole; the other because it points to what in the language of the present day might be called sacramental epiphenomenalism. And here again, as in the Christology of Chalcedon, the middle way is not compromise; it is direction."

Church Congress Syllabus No. 5

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND REUNION PART III
REUNION WITH THE EASTERN CHURCHES

By THE REV. PERCY V. NORWOOD, PH.D.

Professor of Church History

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

THE APPROACH

The Anglican Communion is committed, officially and wholeheartedly, to the cause of Christian reunion, and that upon the very highest grounds and in the most definite and comprehensive form. We may not rest satisfied with a unity based upon "expediency" rather than upon the perceived will of God, nor with a "unity of the Spirit" superimposed upon continuing or thinly disguised denominationalism. Nor, if we are in accord with the declared principles and policies of our Communion (Quadrilateral, Lambeth Conferences, Faith and Order), may we rest content with the uniting of either Catholic Christendom alone or Evangelical Protestant Christianity alone. We are committed to pray for and work for the restoration of *visible unity* to the blessed company of *all* faithful people.

Such a goal is beset with obstacles, humanly speaking insuperable. Many tentative steps and intermediate measures will have to be taken before it can be even approximated. We need a robust realism sometimes lacking in our discussions—a realism which, never losing sight of the goal however distant and beset, occupies itself with problems of sacred strategy: how best that goal may be approached without loss or rebuff. How, for example, can we hope that within any humanly measurable time both Eastern Orthodox and Southern Baptists, both Congregationalists and Roman Catholics, are to be brought into the visible

fellowship of *Una Sancta*? Yet nothing short of this is the goal to which we are committed.

Our Anglican history and heritage have given us a peculiar technique. Our comprehensiveness enables us to open, simultaneously, negotiations on a dangerously wide front, while it makes it all but impossible to carry any one of these approaches to a successful conclusion—as by now we ought to be all too well aware. In the half-century since the Quadrilateral we have accomplished much in advancing knowledge and mutual understanding through conference and correspondence; but in extending the range of intercommunion the net result is slight indeed. Our action is impeded by party attitudes producing a state of tension that makes it difficult for the Church to act at all. The very comprehensiveness which renders it so easy to initiate renders it equally hard to conclude. There are among us those—individuals and groups—who are eager for “home” reunion with Evangelical Protestantism and cold toward Catholic reunion. Likewise, there are individuals and groups among us banded together for Catholic union—with East or West or both—to whom any suggestion of Protestant reunion in which we are participants is unpalatable. Each fears the loss of a priceless part of our heritage, or is genuinely concerned lest a door opened in one direction will be offset by the closing of a door in the other. These are serious considerations. Neither group, however, is in full accord with the expressed mind and purpose of our Church as a whole. Probably we shall continue to make small progress toward Christian unity until we have attained a much larger measure of internal coherence than is evident at the moment. We are balked by a fatal antagonism of forces within, resulting in a virtual immobility. Our vaunted comprehensiveness is proving itself a source of weakness.

Divergences within our own Communion and schisms among Christian churches have developed through centuries and crystallized through still more centuries. It is not to be expected that they can be overcome in a year or a decade. Meanwhile, the Church—and the great Head of the Church—calls us to work

for unity. In this undertaking neither Rome nor the East nor Evangelical Protestantism may be ignored without disregarding the terms of that call. Formal compliance, furthermore, is not enough. There must be a sincere *will* to understand and at length to be at one, even with those whom we now find least congenial.

ANGLICANISM AND ORTHODOXY

Orthodoxy means both "right-believing" and "right-worshipping." By its appropriation of this term the Eastern Church registers its claim to be in an exclusive sense the legitimate continuation of the Apostolic and Patristic Church—that it alone has preserved intact the content of primitive truth and practice, from which Rome has departed by way of addition and Protestantism by way of diminution. For the present we may leave out of account the several Separated Churches of the East, to which the word *Orthodox* does not properly apply. This claim to be exclusively the true Church, the sole mediator of Christian truth and grace in fulness, is as uncompromising as the corresponding claims of Rome, although it rests upon very different premises. One is based upon agreement in doctrine—and so far as may be, in cult and practice—with what is assumed to be the teaching of the Apostles and the Fathers, without raising the important question whether in fact patristic theology is in substantial consonance with that of the Apostolic age; the other is based upon submission to a particular prelate as the Vicar of Christ, and to a particular local Church as the mother and mistress of all churches. The one speaks in terms of dogmatic accord; the other in terms of imperialism for which divine sanction is assumed as axiomatic. Rome regards non-Roman Christendom as rebellion against divinely constituted authority. The Orthodox regard the non-Orthodox as fellow-Christians who in various ways and in differing degrees have diverged from primitive Catholic truth—from the Apostles and Fathers and Ecumenical Councils—and so have separated themselves from the fellowship of the Church. Thus, Orthodoxy is free either to deny the validity and efficacy

of our sacraments—as has sometimes been done, even in the case of Baptism—or to recognize them by the *praxis* of “economy” where departure from strict standards is judged to be not too great, or where there is an evident will to approximate to Orthodox teaching.

It is obvious, then, that the Orthodox conception of the Church is more restricted than any held by Anglicans, whether it be the Tractarian “three-branch” theory or the more inclusive conception implied in certain recent formal pronouncements. That the Eastern delegation to the 1920 Lambeth Conference were fully aware of this difference is clear from their report: “The idea of the Church among them [Anglicans], as many among us do not realize, is much wider than ours. While with us the true member of the Church, who continues in organic union with the whole, must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the Holy Sacraments, and believe in lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles; in the English Church men differing from each other in faith, not in things indifferent and non-essential, constitute one undivided whole.”¹ One notes here the emphasis laid upon dogmatic agreement, and along with this the implication that Orthodoxy regards as “essential” some matters which we do not commonly consider as such. In any discussion of reunion with the East these points must always be kept in mind—the more so as they cut straight across the prerequisites for any program of “home” reunion.

The situation is somewhat relieved in that in Orthodoxy the field of dogmatic definition is, in comparison with Rome, much restricted: strictly speaking, it is limited to the decisions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils of the “Undivided” Church, to which we must presumably add—so far as the principle *lex orandi lex credendi* is applicable—the doctrinal implications of cultus and liturgy. The “theologoumena” of the Fathers and the symbolic books of modern times are regarded, at least by representative theologians, as having only subsidiary authority. Furthermore, the Orthodox refuse to attempt to explain, as did the

¹ Bell, *Documents*, p. 57.

Western Schoolmen, the *mysteries* of faith, or to pyramid dogma upon dogma by assumed logical necessity. The genius of Eastern theology is intuitive rather than dialectic; it is characterized by a reverent reserve before the mysteries of revelation rather than by the Western scholastic passion to explore and define. Its supreme concern has been to work out a Christology that will perpetuate the conception of salvation taught by Athanasius and the Greek Fathers generally.

Modern Eastern theologians recognize that there may be *degrees* of Orthodoxy—a point of view which is capable of helpful application in approaches to unity between episcopal and non-episcopal churches. Thus, Sergius Bulgakov remarks that “all ecclesiastical communities, even those whose road is farthest from that of the Orthodox Church, preserve a considerable part of the universal tradition, and, as a result of this, share in Orthodoxy. They all have ‘a grain’ of Orthodoxy.”²

The Eastern Church is thus a *via media* between Rome and Protestantism—more so in spirit than in form, as Leroy-Beaulieu has observed. And Stefan Zankov says in so many words that in many respects Orthodoxy is closer to Protestantism than to Roman Catholicism: in its attitude toward Holy Scripture, in its Christocentric piety, in regard to its doctrine of sin and grace, in its rejection of work-merit and *satisfaction* together with the Roman doctrine which flows from these. Further, “Protestant and Orthodox are nearer each other in the doctrine of the sacraments, since both emphasize the inner and personal position in contrast to the Roman Catholic conception of the mechanical effect of the sacraments.”³

It has long been recognized on both sides—and increasingly so as we have come to understand each other better—that in important respects Orthodoxy has particularly close affinities with normative Anglicanism. As far back as 1870, Archbishop Lycurgus of Syra assured the Bishop of Ely: “When I return to Greece I will say that the Church of England is not like other

² *Orthodox Church*, p. 214.

³ *Eastern Orthodox Church*, pp. 156 f.

Protestant bodies. I will say that it is a sound Catholic Church, very like our own." Though belonging to quite different streams of race and culture, and though their history has been strikingly disparate, they have in common: preservation of and high regard for ancient Catholic Order as guaranteeing ecclesiastical continuity; rejection of papal claims and novel dogmas as departures from the faith once delivered; high regard for antiquity as registered in the Ecumenical Councils and the Fathers; distrust of scholastic subtleties; a theology based upon the Incarnation rather than upon the Atonement; a sacramental philosophy and practice founded upon this Incarnational theology; the "open Bible" in the language of the people, used both liturgically and extra-liturgically. Both accept the principle of autocephalous churches bound together by agreement in doctrine and cultus, which yet leaves room for local differences of custom. Both locate ecclesiastical authority in the whole body of the Church without exaggerated clericalism—are hierarchical without being hierocratic. (Consensus, *sobornost*, "conciliarity.") Both reject the idea that the laity are nothing more than *ecclesia discens*.

Insofar as the Anglican Reformation involved a return from papalism and scholasticism to ancient Catholic faith and order, it was a return toward the position of the Orthodox Church, the *via media* which is also *via antiqua*. Representative Anglican theology, furthermore, has always appealed particularly to the Greek Fathers; and it has been relatively free from that Augustinian pessimism as to human nature which has obsessed the continental Reformed Churches, as it has been from the excessive legalism of Rome. Like Orthodoxy, it has held a just balance between divine grace and human freedom—so much so that, like the East, we have sometimes been accused of Pelagian tendencies. Again, we recovered at the Reformation—and since—that sense of *corporate* worship which our Eastern brethren have never lost. All this is, obviously, a favorable orientation. And beyond all this there is a subtle and intangible something—certain nuances of spirit and ethos—that would make Orthodoxy, with its inwardness and mysticism, its martyr-like tenacity of conviction,

its evangelical *naïveté* and humility, irresistibly attractive to many of us, were it not for barriers of race and language and culture. Its modes of thought and operation are far more like our own than the rigid regimentation characteristic of Latin Catholicism.

Over against these similarities, however, we must set some no less significant points of difference. The Eastern Church, with "true doctrine" as its title-deed, with fidelity to tradition in fulness as its proudest boast, is bound to find our comprehensiveness—our facile distinction between the few simple "essentials" and the larger range of "accessories"—an enigma. When we think realistically, we know that the sort of unity we Anglicans have in mind can be obtained only by reducing dogmatic agreement to a minimum of things "incapable of compromise or surrender," as the Quadrilateral put it. The Orthodox cannot imagine a unity bought on such terms, nor would they consider it worth the price, even were it obtainable. For them there can be no formal unity (no intercommunion) without a substantial measure of doctrinal agreement. Orthodoxy insists upon asking us: Do you Anglicans believe in the grace of Orders—in a true priesthood—in the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice? Do you believe in seven sacraments—or in two only? Do you accept the authority of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and holy tradition? What is the force of the Articles of Religion with their protestantizing implications? Responsible Anglican spokesmen have sought to give satisfactory answers to these questions, to the grave disquietude of Evangelicals and modernists. One can but wonder what our brethren of the Eastern Church make out of such phenomena as the Archbishops' Doctrinal Report. It is a truism to remark that there are groups in our Communion who are much nearer to the Orthodox than Anglicanism as a whole—just as there are other groups much farther away. The implications of this obvious fact may well be pondered. The matter is discussed at some length in J. A. Douglas' *Relations of the Anglican Church with the Eastern Orthodox*.

Of more specific differences, the great age-long dogmatic dissonance between East and West, the unsanctioned *filioque* addi-

tion to the Creed, seems capable of satisfactory explanation and adjustment. But Orthodoxy's insistence on immersion in Baptism, its practice in Confirmation (*Chrism*), its use of icons—involving the whole question of the ecumenical character of the Second Council of Nicaea—its cult of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints: these remain as difficulties, at least for central Anglicanism, as they were for the Nonjurors. Or should we say, rather, that Anglican practice raises problems for the Orthodox? When all is said and done, however, the Eastern Church regards Anglo-Catholicism—save for that portion of it with Romeward orientation—as its closest spiritual kin; a conviction which seems to be quite properly reciprocated. The Anglican Communion will itself be similarly esteemed in measure as the "Catholic party" is judged to be its dominant voice.⁴

ANGLICAN-ORTHODOX RELATIONS

The cleavage between the Eastern and Western parts of Christendom widened slowly over several centuries, as differences of race, language, temperament, and external fortune made themselves felt. It became acute during the "Photian Schism" (ninth century) and the final break occurred in the middle of the eleventh. The arrogance of the crusading "Franks," particularly the outrageous Latin Empire and Patriarchate at Constantinople, left behind an aftermath of bitterness not easily to be forgotten. With the rejection of the paper-concord of Florence by the indignant Greek and Russian people all real hope of reunion was at an end, though Rome has never ceased to intrigue, cajole, or flatter, as seemed most opportune. The Reformers in their repudiation of papal jurisdiction became conscious of the Orthodox Church as one which had never acknowledged it beyond the terms of the ancient canons, but early Lutheran attempts at rapprochement came to naught by reason of weighty doctrinal disagreements.

The first definite contacts between the reformed Church of England and the Orthodox belong to the time of the Calvinistically-inclined Cyril Lucar, Patriarch successively of Alexandria and

⁴ Douglas, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

Constantinople, who entered into correspondence with the Puritan Archbishop Abbot, as he did with theologians of the continental Reformed Churches. At that time English theology stood under the shadow of Calvin's *Institutes*, from which such men as Andrewes and Laud—both of them good friends of the Orthodox—were striving to free it. The relationships thus begun were continued during the Cromwellian regime by Anglican exiles sojourning in the Levant (Dr. Isaac Basire and others) and after the Restoration by English ambassadors and chaplains in the domains of the Sultan. As one of them put it: "It hath been my constant desire to dispose . . . the Greek Church to a communion with the Church of England, together with a convenient reformation of some grosser errors." Eastern prelates were welcomed to England, Greek theological students were for a short while sheltered at Oxford, and a church for Greek residents was erected in Soho. The moving spirit behind all this seems to have been the energetic Compton, Bishop of London, gratefully remembered for his benefactions to American colonial parishes. A note to the Nicene Creed was suggested explaining the *filioque* in the interest of rapprochement with the Orthodox.

In their isolation, the Nonjurors, who regarded themselves as the "Catholic remnant" unjustly cast out of the national Church, naturally turned toward the East—both Greeks and Russians—with proposals for a Concordat. A considerable correspondence ensued during the years 1716–23, in the course of which it appeared that neither side was prepared to accept the doctrinal demands of the other. Archbishop Wake, who had himself an eye on the East, played his part by explaining to the Patriarchs that the Nonjurors were not the proper Church of England. However, the flirtation led the Nonjurors to study the Eastern Liturgies to the decided enrichment of their own—and, ultimately, of ours and that of the Anglican Communion generally, since every recent liturgical revision has looked to the East for its models.

Since only "Catholic-minded" Anglicans are likely to have any particular sympathy with Orthodoxy, it is not surprising that intercourse practically ceased during the Hanoverian century preceding

the Oxford Movement. With the revival of Catholic consciousness among the Tractarians, contacts between the two Communion were resumed and have grown closer with every passing decade. At first it was mainly a *party* approach, but by 1862-3 both the General Convention of the American Church and the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury gave it a formal character as the gesture of the whole Church. The most piquant episode of the earlier phase was the persistent but unsuccessful effort of that odd figure, "Deacon" William Palmer, of Magdalen, to convince the Orthodox that the Anglican Church is truly Catholic and Apostolic, and to force a practical recognition of the Tractarian "three-branch" theory. The story of this attempt was made known many years later by no less a person than Cardinal Newman.⁵ Of English Churchmen who have labored to explain Anglicanism to Orthodoxy and Orthodoxy to Anglicanism, John Mason Neale and William J. Birkbeck occupy a place of particular distinction; but one should not forget Bishops Gore, John Wordsworth, Russell Wakefield, and Headlam; nor George Williams and Littledale and Fynes-Clinton and J. A. Douglas; nor Mr. Birkbeck's disciple and editor, Mr. Athelstan Riley; nor in this country Bishops Young and Hale, among others. The Eastern Church Association was launched in London in 1863-4 to promote study and mutual understanding, to work toward intercommunion so far as might be possible, and to assist the Orthodox hierarchy in educational and spiritual reform. In those same years the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to coöperate with a similar committee of the American Church already set up by General Convention in exploring the possibilities of intercommunion—or more precisely, reciprocal extension of sacramental ministrations—between the Anglican Churches and the Eastern Patriarchates.

Stirred by the romance of the Greek war of liberation, the American Church—several years prior to the beginning of the Oxford Movement—had initiated an educational enterprise in the Levant. The Robertsons and Hills opened schools at Athens and

⁵ *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840-41.* 1882.

Syra. The mission was presently reinforced by the sending of Horatio Southgate as a "movement of Catholic love—to save, not to win; to deliver and repair, not to add." In 1844 Southgate was consecrated—one of our two first foreign missionary bishops—to serve in Turkey in friendly collaboration with and support of the ancient Eastern Churches. In the existing state of party tension Bishop Southgate's conception of his mission as primarily one of reconciliation was resented by the Evangelicals and he resigned after some six years of controversy.

The Anglo-Prussian joint bishopric in Jerusalem was designed to be "an embassy of peace and good will" to the Eastern Church, and so it proved under its first bishop, Dr. Alexander. His successor, Gobat, nominated by Prussia, turned toward a policy of proselytizing, to the dismay of Catholic Anglicans, and the project was presently buried. When the Jerusalem bishopric was revived some fifty years ago it was free of that embarrassing partnership.

The acquisition of Alaska confronted the American Church with Russian Orthodoxy within our natural sphere of jurisdiction. Several years prior to that event, the Convention of 1862, despite some opposition from Evangelical stalwarts, had adopted a resolution creating a joint committee "to consider the expediency of opening communication with the Russo-Greek Church." In 1865 the membership of this committee was enlarged and its competence extended to include "other branches of the Oriental Church." Two members of this body visited Russia. The reports made by the Russo-Greek committee to the General Conventions, 1865-74, should be consulted by all who are interested in the course and progress of our relations with the Orthodox.

The impulse from America was speedily transmitted to the Church of England, and in 1863 the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to work in conjunction with the American committee "as to intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church"—language which goes beyond anything expressly included in the cautious action of General Convention.

It is not surprising that some ardent Anglican proponents of unity were all too optimistic as to the conditions under which the

Orthodox Church can properly concede intercommunion. In reply to a proposal for mutual exchange of ministerial services in emergency—burial, Baptism, Holy Communion—for Anglicans in the Levant and Orthodox in Anglo-Saxon lands, the Ecumenical Patriarch countered by pointing out certain “novelties” in the XXXIX Articles which seemed to justify doubt as to the orthodoxy of the Anglican Church. The request as to burial privileges, however, could easily be granted. Undaunted, the English and American Churches continued to press for exchange of sacramental ministrations, until it has been practically accorded—by no means as formal intercommunion, even in emergencies, but as *praxis* based upon the useful but not easily defined principle of *economia*.⁶ For we must remember that for Orthodoxy intercommunion can be only where there is explicit agreement in doctrine, and that possession of Apostolic ministry and profession of the Nicene and Chalcedonian formularies are not in themselves sufficient to establish right belief. However, the Church’s stewardship is such that she may, in her exercise of “economy,” make exceptions in specific instances where dogma is not compromised and where the larger good of the Church or of Christian fellowship is served thereby. In the exercise of this discretion she can validate—within the limits above indicated—that which is not strictly valid, and admit to her privileges those who strictly are not entitled to them.

LAMBETH AND AFTER

Further progress in Anglican-Orthodox relations may be traced in the proceedings of the Lambeth Conferences, beginning with that of 1888, albeit one should remember that several constituent Churches of our Communion were simultaneously pursuing their own negotiations. The measure of accomplishment is best studied in the Conference Reports. The Conference of 1888 showed itself rather uncertain as to the prospects. “It would not be right,” said the committee on Eastern Churches, “to disguise

⁶ See J. A. Douglas, *Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*, chs. 2, 3.

from ourselves the hindrances which exist on either side." The uncanonically added *filioque*, while capable of satisfactory explanation, has gained such a prescriptive right in the Western Church "that it may be very difficult to remove." After referring to differences of practice in Baptism and Confirmation, the committee continued: "It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that [Orthodox] Church so long as it retains the use of icons, the invocation of Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin. . . . Moreover, the Second Council of Nicaea, sanctioning the use of icons . . . having been deliberately rejected seven years afterwards by the Council of Frankfort, and not having been accepted by the Latin Church till after the lapse of two centuries, and then only under papal influence, cannot be regarded as binding upon the Church." However, a ray of hope is seen in the circumstance that Orthodoxy "has never committed itself to any theory that would make it impossible to reconsider and revise its standards and practice." Meanwhile, Anglicanism should hold out a helping hand in education and spiritual recovery, while seeking to convince the Orthodox as to "our real claims as a historical Church."

The Conference of 1897 requested the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London to become the nucleus of a larger committee to confer with the authorities of the Eastern Churches with a view to the possibilities of clearer understanding and closer relations—particularly through translations and publications whereby each Communion might become better known to the other. There is warm appreciation of the work already done in this field by the American committee set up by General Convention.

In reporting to the 1908 Conference the committee say that "they are of opinion that efforts after unity are in no sense furthered by a whittling away of our distinctive position, and hold that whilst we should always be ready to answer the questions of others as to our position, we are bound to seek a like satisfaction at their hands They are strongly of opinion that the more satisfactory way is to seize every opportunity of mutual service,

in the sure conviction that obstacles which now appear insurmountable may in the course of time be found to vanish away." Wise words, these, and as valid today as they were a generation ago.

Before the Lambeth Conference of 1920 the World War had forged fresh ties between Anglicanism and several of the Orthodox Churches, while in America the movement for a world conference on Faith and Order had already been launched. Committees had been formed in Athens and Constantinople to co-operate with the Archbishops' Eastern Churches Committee, and a delegation was sent to Lambeth from the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Shortly before the opening of the Conference the Patriarch had addressed an eirenic Encyclical to "All the Churches of Christ, wheresoever they be," breathing a truly Christian and evangelical spirit.

The Conference pointed out the importance, not only of explaining to the Easterns the doctrinal position of our Communion and of exhibiting the evidence for our Apostolic ministry, but in particular "to make it clear from our formularies that we regard Ordination as conferring grace and not only as a mere setting apart to an ecclesiastical office."

From this point on one should consult a series of pronouncements (Nos. 13-22) printed in G. K. A. Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-24*. The validity of Anglican Orders, sometimes under suspicion, had for years been a subject of careful investigation by Orthodox scholars. In the summer of 1922 the Ecumenical Patriarch was able to inform the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Holy Synod of Constantinople "has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the Ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the *Charisma* of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession." This decision was communicated by encyclical to the heads of the several Orthodox

Churches and was presently concurred in by the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Archbishop of Cyprus. It should, of course, be borne in mind that this pronouncement is not a strictly formal approval of our Orders by the Eastern Orthodox Communion, nor does it imply or authorize intercommunion so long as doctrinal differences exist.

On both sides of the Atlantic the exploration of dogmatic questions has continued during the past two decades, with proposed concordats and terms of intercommunion, declarations of Faith irenically stated, and many conferences and conversations. Some of these have emanated from party groups and Church Unity societies; others have come from officially sponsored commissions. In the center of discussion we find: the authority of the Church and of tradition, the number of the sacraments (*mysteria*), the Eucharistic Presence and sacrifice, priesthood and Apostolic Succession, the *praxis* of reciprocity in the sacraments in exercise of economy. An imposing Orthodox delegation, headed by Meletius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and the Metropolitan of Thyateira (representing the Ecumenical Patriarch) was sent to the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The Report presents a rather lengthy resumé of discussions which took place between the bishops and the Eastern delegates. By resolution, the Archbishop of Canterbury was requested to invite the Ecumenical Patriarch to join in creating a Doctrinal Commission to study points of difference and agreement.

Of all recent Anglican-Orthodox conferences, perhaps the one which has attracted the widest attention and called forth the loudest clamor was that held in Bucharest five years ago. Its findings were vigorously attacked in the *Modern Churchman* and the *Churchman* (quarterly theological journal of the English Evangelical group) as a repudiation of the Reformation principles of the Church of England and a sell-out to medievalism. And this despite the fact—or possibly all the more because of the fact—that Convocation had voiced approval of the conference findings as consonant with legitimate Anglican doctrine. We have to hold ourselves ready frankly to face the fact that any

rapprochement which carries promise of success in this direction is bound to meet resistance from considerable groups among us as a betrayal of our position among the Reformed Churches, and as impeding the sort of reunion in which they are primarily interested.

PROSPECTS

Multitudes of Eastern Christians in the *diaspora* have come to regard our Church as their second spiritual home—instructed by their clergy to seek our ministrations when deprived of opportunity for their own. From time to time we participate in Orthodox worship, and they in ours. We freely extend to each other the privilege of the sanctuary. These exchanges of Christian courtesy, these acts of mutual helpfulness, are possible only because there is no suspicion of any design to proselytize. They might be carried much farther were our laity less obsessed by racial and social cleavages or by smugly unintelligent devotion to ultra-respectable Protestant Episcopalianism. The stranger within our gates is all too often frightened by our prim proprieties. By and large, our people lag far behind the stand which our Church has officially taken and are sadly in need of education as to the meaning of Christian fellowship.

The Orthodox have in fact, if not in full formality, recognized the validity of our orders, and diverse matters of misunderstanding have been cleared up in the course of conference. They think of us as their closest spiritual kin and are more than ready to coöperate in Christian enterprise. Can the next—the final step—be taken? Is formal intercommunion possible?

Probably not at present, because the Orthodox Church insists upon dogmatic agreement as a *sine qua non* of reunion. This is a price we are hardly prepared to pay. Both our comprehensiveness and our modernity make against it. As a whole, and apart from a relatively small group of intelligentsia, Orthodoxy has been untouched by the Enlightenment which has so powerfully affected Anglican and Protestant thinking since the seventeenth century. This is at once the consequence of its isolation

and the price it has had to pay for its unswerving fidelity to Christian antiquity—to tradition and the Fathers. Some among us, of course, are disturbed by the "Catholicism" of the Eastern Church; others of us are more troubled by its *fundamentalism*. Upon reflection one can understand why *liberal* Anglo-Catholics might have difficulty in subscribing to its doctrinal demands upon us.

From our point of view, the great need is for Orthodoxy to develop a spirit of constructive criticism to balance and scrutinize tradition—if you will, to "modernize" its thinking without renouncing its ancient faith, as we have been forced to do. Are there any prospects of this? I think there are. In the first place, it is a maxim of Orthodoxy that the Ecumenical Councils are infallible, not in themselves, but only as accepted by the mind of the Church—as formulations of consensus. But if the Church be not static, consensus may change. Is it not possible that criticism and education may work a slow evolution, a measure of liberation from traditional moulds, as among us they have in our attitude toward the Bible, for example? One must, obviously, reckon with the essential conservatism of the East, as much a product of its history as comprehensiveness is a product of our own. At the same time, we may well be encouraged by our experience of the long and often bitter conflict between old and new, tradition and criticism, in the Western Churches.

In the second place, leading Orthodox theologians, notably Russians, many of them trained in Western universities and not a few of them laymen, have already begun to appropriate and utilize some of the assured results of modern critical scholarship. Nicholas Arseniev, Stefan Zankov, and Sergius Bulgakov are cases in point, to mention only three whose writings are easily accessible in English. With favorable educational opportunities their interpretations may in time filter through to the rank and file at present almost untouched by modernity.

Today there is little excuse for thinking of Eastern Christianity—certainly not in its leadership—as altogether intellectually sterile and obscurantist. One might indeed describe it as on the whole

too subservient to the State and too much wrapped up in superstition and externality, as socially backward and morally doubtful. One might perhaps take seriously the judgment of an unfriendly Roman Catholic critic that it is a shadow out of the past that hardly deserves the name Christian. But even if all this were much truer than it is, neither Romanism, with its acquiescence in tawdry popular cults, its mechanical novenas, and its miraculous medals; nor American Protestantism, with its lunatic-fringe of eccentric and ecstatic sects, can gracefully draw the indictment. The most glaring defects of Orthodoxy are the results of its tragic fate, not a sub-Christian apostasy. Surely, as Heiler has observed, it is entitled to be judged by its best rather than by its lowest manifestations. And its fidelity to the main stream of Christian conviction, its closeness to the sources of revelation, is at least as defensible as the arbitrary reconstructions of much modern Protestant thought. Too much inclined to identify the Fathers and Councils with primitive Christianity, the Greek increment with the original deposit, it has yet not suffered its Hellenic heritage to obscure the Gospel, and so in its basic convictions it is truly evangelical. One feels this in its yearning attitude toward fellow-Christians outside its pale, even when it is constrained to anathematize their errors; and one follows it every step of the way through the warm moving drama of the Divine Liturgy. Whatever the case in the past, humility and large-heartedness are as characteristic of the Orthodox Church today as arrogance is of certain other communions. And if it sometimes takes strong measures to protect its children against the inroads of proselytizing Protestant denominations or raiding Romans, it is doing no more than any Church is logically bound to do which feels confident that it possesses the fuller truth.

THE SEPARATED CHURCHES

While the Orthodox Churches are much the most considerable part of Eastern Christianity, they are by no means the whole of it. There exist a number of Churches separated long centuries ago over questions of Christology: on one wing the Coptic, Abyss-

sinian, Syrian Jacobite, and Armenian Churches, technically Monophysite; on the other the Assyrians, technically Nestorian. Neither of these groups has formally accepted the Chalcedonian formula. They also come within our Anglican purview. The Archbishop of Canterbury has become the special protector of the tortured Assyrian Church, and we have been privileged to aid them in various ways. As we learn more about them we discover that their Christological heresy is more technical than real. As the 1930 Lambeth Conference put it: "All the Churches with which we are here concerned have differed from the Orthodox faith, particularly with regard to the doctrine of the Person of our Lord. In many cases a clearer understanding of the present teaching of a particular Church and a sympathetic study of its liturgies have revealed that the ancient heresy has long since in fact passed away, though perhaps no formal abjuration of the heresy has been or could well be made." In measure as this is the case our problem with regard to the Separated Churches merges itself into the problem of our relations with the Orthodox —*ut omnes unum sint*.

Note. Since the author of this article makes no claim to be a seer or a prophet, he has felt it best to write in terms of historical perspective. What the future may hold for European Christianity is at the moment hard to discern, with war spreading through the Balkans. But it is probably safe to predict that the course of events in the Old World will rapidly accelerate the Americanization of Eastern Christians in the New, and thus open possibilities and responsibilities for us not contemplated in the article. We shall be confronted with deracinated groups desperately in need of our help and sympathy. We must prepare ourselves to hold out to them the warm hand of friendship.

SUGGESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Is our Anglican program of unity too comprehensive to be realistic?
2. What should be our immediate objective (or objectives) in reunion?
3. What practical reasons are there for cultivating closer relations with the Orthodox in the East and in America?
4. How is our rapprochement to the Orthodox related to, how does it compromise or complicate, other unity projects? How is it complicated by them?
5. How may party positions be harmonized with or subordinated to the Church's declared purpose in regard to unity?
6. How far might we properly go toward meeting the doctrinal demands of the Eastern Churches?

7. What specific "goods" have the Eastern Churches to contribute to the United Church of the future?

8. What practical help can Anglicanism give the Eastern Churches in making adjustments to modern thinking?

9. In what ways can we in America best serve Eastern Christian groups among us?

10. How far have we any right to expect these groups to accept our Anglo-Saxon religious *mores*?

11. What are some of the attitudes to be avoided in our relationships with the Eastern Churches, or with Eastern groups in our midst?

12. What problems are raised by ethical differences or social cleavages—and how can these be dealt with most effectively in a Christian spirit?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Orthodoxy

Arseniev, Nicholas. *Mysticism and the Eastern Church*. London, 1926.

Bulgakov, Sergius. *The Orthodox Church*. Milwaukee, 1935.

Callinicos, C. *The Greek Orthodox Church*. London, 1918.

Zankov, Stefan. *The Eastern Orthodox Church*. Milwaukee, 1929.

Gavin, Frank. *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*.

Heiler, Friedrich. *Urkirche und Ostkirche*. Munich, 1937. Probably the most extensive, penetrating, and sympathetic study of the Eastern Churches by any Western scholar.

Langford-James, R. L. *A Dictionary of the Eastern Orthodox Church*. London, 1923.

Riley, Athelstan, Editor, *Birkbeck and the Russian Church*. London, 1917.

2. Anglicanism and Orthodoxy

Chrysostom Papadopoulos (Archbishop of Athens). *The Validity of Anglican Ordinations*. London, 1930.

Douglas, J. A. *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*. London, 1921.

Ollard, S. L. *Reunion*. Milwaukee, 1919. (Chapter II.)

Shaw, P. E. *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church*. Milwaukee, 1930.

Williams, George. *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*. London, 1868. Correspondence of the Non-jurors, etc.

Wordsworth, John. *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates*. Oxford, 1902.

Reports of the Lambeth Conference, 1888, 1897, 1908, 1920, 1930.

Journals of the General Convention, especially 1865-74.

Bell, G. K. A. *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-24*. Oxford, 1924.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PASSION NARRATIVES

By G. M. STYLER, Cuddesdon College

All four evangelists agree that Jesus was buried in the late afternoon of the day before a sabbath, that is to say on a Friday afternoon: this is made clear especially by Jn. who says¹ that because it was the Preparation the Jews asked of Pilate that the bodies might be taken away and not remain on the cross on the sabbath; and at 19:42 after describing the burial by Joseph and Nicodemus Jn. adds that all this was done "because of the Jews' preparation." Likewise Mk. says² that "when even was come, because it was the Preparation (i.e. the day before the sabbath), there came Joseph . . .": and this chronology is not disturbed by Mt. and Lk., although Mt. only *implies* that it was the Preparation, by saying³ of the following day that it was the day after the Preparation.

We may conclude therefore without much doubt from the complete agreement of the evangelists that the Crucifixion took place on a Friday; and consequently that the Last Supper and the arrest of Jesus took place on a Thursday evening. The exact hours can hardly be fixed with any precision, although Mk. makes an attempt to divide the day⁴ into periods. It was no doubt after daybreak, as Mk. says,⁵ that the Jews brought Jesus before Pilate, and it is very probable that the Jews' own meeting did not take place before dawn.⁶

¹ Jn. 19:31.

² Mk. 15:42.

³ Mt. 27:62.

⁴ Mk. 15:25 and 33-4: if the double cock-crow is part of the original text, he perhaps divides up the preceding night similarly into periods.

⁵ Mk. 15:1.

⁶ As Lk's account has it, but not Mk's. Mt. and Lk. omit to say the crucifixion was at the third hour, but retain the "darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour." In Jn. 19:14 at the sixth hour Pilate is still on the judgment-seat.

The Last Supper therefore took place on a Thursday evening. But we must now admit that for the events which preceded it the Gospels provide no hard and fast chronology. It is true that the Christian tradition has taken over the theory that the events fit into a single week: and the basis of this is to be found in certain notices of time which occur scattered in Mk. According to this scheme, the Entry into Jerusalem was on Palm Sunday: on Monday Jesus cursed the fig-tree and cleansed the Temple: on Tuesday He was engaged in controversies: on Wednesday Judas paid his visit to the priests, and Jesus was in Simon's house: and on Thursday morning the preparations for the Last Supper were made.

Now Mk. makes the transition from the "Sunday"⁷ to "Monday" quite clear: at 11:11 Jesus went out at night to Bethany, and (at 11:12) on the following day after they had come out from Bethany, He felt hungry and saw the fig-tree. The transition to "Tuesday" is less clear: at 11:19 we read "when it was evening they went⁸ out of the city," and at 11:20 "as they passed by in the morning⁹ they saw the fig-tree withered . . ." The transition from "Tuesday" to "Wednesday" is completely non-existent: the Apocalyptic Discourse concludes without a note of time, and the following chapter begins abruptly with the words "And the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread were after two days." We pass from "Wednesday" to "Thursday" at 14:12, and it does seem unlikely that the events described in this new section (the preparations for the Thursday evening, clearly made on Thursday morning) could be supposed to take place more than one day after the events described in 14:1f.; for the Passover was "after two days" during these, and the events of 14:12-16 take place "on the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the passover." As we shall see, Mk. re-

⁷ Mk. gives no indication that the Entry was on the first day of the week.

⁸ ἔξωπορεύθη, which would naturally mean "they used to go out": it may have borne that meaning in Mk's source, if it was in it: whether Mk. meant it in this sense or not we cannot say.

⁹ πρωί, which need not mean "on the following morning" though it may, and in 15:1 must.

garded the Last Supper as the Passover meal: and thus, by strict Jewish reckoning, the Passover would begin at sunset on Thursday, in which case 14:1 cannot refer to a time earlier than Wednesday morning (or Tuesday evening). But it is just possible that Mk. thought there was one day's interval between the events of 14:1f. and 14:12f.; he refers to the sacrifice of the Passover victims, which took place *before* sunset on Thursday; and so it might be possible for him to regard 14:1 as referring to *Tuesday*. But I think that this is unlikely, and that the traditional theory can claim Mk's support for putting the events of 14:1f. and 14:12f. on two consecutive days.

Nevertheless although the impression of a Holy "*Week*" can thus be derived from Mk., it is by no means certain that Mk. himself held this rigid chronology: witness the uncertainty of the transition from "*Monday*" to "*Tuesday*" and the absence of any link between "*Tuesday*" and "*Wednesday*." To postulate only one day's interval between the day on which the Temple was cleansed and the events of 14:1f.,¹⁰ is to go beyond what Mk. consciously intended.¹¹

In fact the interval between the Triumphal Entry and the Last Supper may well have been longer than a week: but we should beware of relying upon an examination of the sequence of events given in Mk. to substantiate this view; we should not, that is, argue that more than one day is needed for all the conflicts and discourses which the traditional theory ascribes to "*Tuesday*," for in fact Mk's arrangement here is topical, rather than chronological. The group of "*conflict*" stories reminds us of the

¹⁰ Dibelius points out that 14:2, which refers to the Jews' reluctance to arrest Jesus during the feast, must be pre-Markan, because it conflicts with Mk's view that the arrest did in fact take place after the feast had begun. But whether the ascription of Judas' treachery to Wednesday rests on the authority of this same source is not clear: for 14:1 does not necessarily belong to it, and in any case Mk's interpolation of the Anointing blurs the connexion. We cannot conclude from 14:11 that Judas' search for his opportunity must have extended over a long period: it may have arisen the following night, as Mk. says.

¹¹ Mk. *does* give the impression that Jesus' sojourn in Jerusalem was short; Lk. modifies this.

similar group in the first section of Mk's gospel:¹² and we may suppose that Mk. found it convenient to place this group at this point in order to bring out the various ways in which the Jews were opposed to Jesus and His teaching.¹³ Although the stories were probably collected in a group before Mk. used them, we can still notice the detached introduction to some of them.¹⁴

Nevertheless on general grounds, as well as from indications in Mk.¹⁵ and the testimony of Lk. and Jn., we can be fairly confident that Jesus was in Jerusalem for more than a single week. However much the Jewish authorities might disapprove of what they had heard concerning the prophet of Galilee, we must suppose that it was what Jesus said and did in Jerusalem that provoked them to deliver Him up to the Roman power: and two days can hardly be deemed sufficient for this.

In their general arrangement of the last recorded events in Jesus' life, Mt. and Lk. follow Mk's plan, Mt. very closely. But even so it would never have been possible to construct a scheme of a Holy "Week" from *their* narratives. Mt. compresses the events of Mk's "Sunday" and "Monday" into one day: in his second day he compresses the two phases of the incident of the fig-tree into one account, and thereafter describes the conflicts and discourses without any statement that at night Jesus went out of the city, such as Mk. has: and there is no possibility that at 26:1 Mt. has in mind the transition from one day to the next day following: the verse reads, "When Jesus had finished all these sayings, He said unto His disciples 'Ye know that after two days . . .'" But as in Mk., the crucifixion in Mt. is on Friday, the discovery of the Empty Tomb on Sunday, after the sabbath.

Lk. follows Mk's general arrangement, but he deliberately effaces the impression which Mk. in part gives that the events of Jesus' days in Jerusalem can be fitted into a single week. He has

¹² Mk. 2:1-3:6.

¹³ And to the teaching of the early Church as well.

¹⁴ Cf. Mk. 12:18, and also the awkward pendant to the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen in 12:12 (*καὶ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς παραβολῆς*) which indicates that the parable is no longer in its original setting. Mt. and Lk. omit this pendant.

¹⁵ Mk. 14:49.

no transition from day to day.¹⁶ The conflict stories, too, are introduced by a phrase which vaguely suggests that Jesus was in Jerusalem for a longer period that would be necessary for the events actually on record to take place: for he writes,¹⁷ "It came to pass on one of the days, as He was teaching the people in the Temple and preaching the gospel" And in the third place the words in which he makes the transition from the Apocalyptic Discourse to the Passion Narrative reinforce this suggestion: "And every day He was teaching in the Temple; and every night He went out and lodged in the mount that is called the mount of Olives."¹⁸ Like Mk. however he holds that Jesus died and was buried on a Friday: on the sabbath the women rested according to the commandment,¹⁹ and on the first day of the week they discovered that the Tomb was empty and heard the tidings of Jesus' Resurrection.

In Jn. we have, as often, an atmosphere of utter timelessness combined with a few very explicit statements of place and time: thus, apart from his insistence that the Passover coincided with the sabbath (wherein he disagrees with Mk.) and not with the "day" which began at sunset on Thursday, we have the statements that "Jesus came to Bethany . . . six days before the Passover"²⁰ and that the Triumphal Entry was "on the following day."²¹ It is difficult to be certain on what days of the week Jn. envisaged these events as taking place: according to strict Jewish reckoning, whereby "days" begin at sunset and counting is inclusive, Jesus' arrival at Bethany and the Anointing²² would be on Nisan 10th, which would begin with sunset on Sunday: the

¹⁶ The transition at Mk. 11:11 was perhaps bound to disappear in Lk. along with his omission of the incident of the fig-tree.

¹⁷ Lk. 20:1.

¹⁸ Lk. 21:37.

¹⁹ Lk. 23: 54-6.

²⁰ Jn. 12:1: the story of the Anointing follows at once—in Mk. it is at least three days later.

²¹ Jn. 12:12.

²² On Nisan 10th the sacrificial lamb was consecrated (Exodus 12:3): the Lamb of God is on this day consecrated for His death. The symbolism is striking, as has been pointed out, and is perhaps deliberate.

Triumphal Entry will thus be at the earliest on Monday morning²³ and may be as late as Tuesday afternoon. Jn. is aware that the Jewish "day" began at sunset:²⁴ by assuming however that by "six days" he means six "natural" days, and that his reckoning is not inclusive—which seems the less likely assumption—we can just stretch his scheme sufficiently to put the Triumphal Entry on "Palm" Sunday.

Jn. cannot of course be cited as a witness to the view that Jesus was in Jerusalem only for a few days before His death. For Jn. the Triumphal Entry is one of the latest of the incidents in Jesus' life, and is long subsequent to His last arrival in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem: He has already attracted much attention, especially by the raising of Lazarus, and Caiaphas has already made his unwitting prophecy of the "expediency" of Jesus' death.

We may suspect that not one of the evangelists has given us a completely accurate account of the events which preceded the Last Supper: Jesus was certainly in Jerusalem during His lifetime for longer than Mk's account, taken at its face value, implies, and Lk. was probably conscious of this; in fact Jn's statements that Jesus had visited Jerusalem more than once before must almost certainly be accepted.²⁵ In this case however we are no longer compelled to assume that all the events in Jesus' life which took place in Jerusalem must be ascribed to His final visit there.

The date of the Cleansing of the Temple can perhaps be fixed with some degree of accuracy. For the "money-changers" were no doubt in the Temple in order to provide the Tyrian currency in which the tax of half a shekel had to be paid: this tax was due on Nisan 1st and it seems that it was during the week immediately preceding that the money-changers set up their tables ac-

²³ τῇ ἐπαύριον surely need not mean on the next "Jewish" day.

²⁴ See Jn. 19:31.

²⁵ Apart from the general probability that one who was brought up in the Jewish tradition would not ignore the national capital, we have the Q saying preserved in Mt. 23:37 and Lk. 13:34 which is otherwise very hard to explain, and also the general impression that Jesus was well known in Jerusalem—to friends as well as enemies. He has friends in Bethany, and can arrange for the use of a room in the city.

tually within the precincts of the Temple. So we may conclude that the incident of the Cleansing of the Temple took place slightly more than two weeks before the Passover. It is true that a few scholars have accepted the Johannine dating, whereby it occurs early in Jesus' ministry: ²⁶ the prelude to the final conspiracy of the Jews is for Jn. not the Cleansing of the Temple, but the Raising of Lazarus. He is aware however that at the time of this incident the Passover was "at hand," ²⁷ and that the Jews brought some accusation against Jesus of His having referred to the destruction of the Temple: but he contrives to allegorize the saying, removing the directness of Jesus' prediction, ²⁸ and he was probably glad to take the whole incident with this awkward saying of Jesus out of the context which it occupies in Mk. ²⁹ But Mk's date must, it seems, be preferred.

Jesus was therefore in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem for more than two weeks before His arrest, and there is some evidence that during this period He took precautions against being arrested. In the daytime He appeared openly in the Temple, and was apparently protected by the favour of the multitude, in the presence of which His enemies dared not risk any move against Him: ³⁰ but at other times, especially at night, He seems to have gone more or less into hiding. According to Jn., ³¹ Thomas was well aware of the danger that Jesus was to incur by venturing near Jerusalem. To avoid the danger, Jesus seems to have spent at least the nights in Bethany, which was on the slopes of the Mount of Olives. ³² After Mk's "Sunday," we read, "Jesus went out to Bethany with the Twelve:" ³³ after "Monday,"

²⁶ Jn. 2:13-22.

²⁷ Jn. 2:13.

²⁸ Jn. 2:19.

²⁹ Lk. omits the charge that Jesus had prophesied the destruction of the Temple. Mk. is embarrassed by it; he words it at 14:58 in such a way as to draw its sting as far as possible, and in the next verse adds that the testimony of the witnesses did not agree. This comment is omitted by Mt., a fact which opens the way to a variety of speculations.

³⁰ See Mk. 12:12, 14:2, Lk. 19:47, 20:26 and Jn. 11:48 and 12:19.

³¹ Jn. 11:16.

³² Mk. 11:1.

³³ Mk. 11:11.

"when it was late they went out of the city"⁸⁴—doubtless to Bethany, for at 14:3 Jesus is in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, and at 14:12 He is still outside the city. Lk. states more clearly⁸⁵ that it was Jesus' practice to teach in the Temple by day, and to go out of the city at night: but we can already infer as much as this from the statements of Mk.

Jn. seems to know even more than Mk. about Jesus' connexion with Bethany: it was in the house of Mary, Martha and Lazarus⁸⁶ that He stayed, there also that He was anointed. Jn. also says that after Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem, He "walked no more openly among the Jews," because "they were taking counsel to put Him to death," "but departed thence into the country near the wilderness into a city named Ephraim."⁸⁷ There is no other evidence, but Jn. may here be preserving an authentic tradition. Jn. also records that in Jesus' absence the chief priests and the Pharisees "had given commandment that if any man knew where He was, he should shew it, that they might take Him."⁸⁸ In the last place we may also notice Jn's statement that after Jesus' discourse on the glorification and lifting up of the Son of Man and on the presence of the light of the world, "He departed and hid Himself from them."⁸⁹

The statements of Jn. receive some support in the explicit narrative of Mk. It seems that Jesus' enemies were unable to find Him at night without Judas' coöperation: and as the arrangements by which the two disciples were to find the room for the "Passover" meal clearly must have prevented Judas from knowing in advance where Jesus was to be that evening, it is hard not to suppose that Jesus had an agreement with the "man bearing a pitcher of water," and it seems likely that He *deliberately* adopted this method so that Judas should remain in ignorance. We may conclude therefore that during this period of a fortnight

⁸⁴ Mk. 11:19, cf. note 8.

⁸⁵ Lk. 21:37-8.

⁸⁶ Jn. 12:1-2.

⁸⁷ Jn. 11:53-4: Ephraim was about 15 miles from Jerusalem, to the north-east of Bethel. At 10:40 Jn. records a similar withdrawal, "beyond Jordan."

⁸⁸ Jn. 11:57.

⁸⁹ Jn. 12:36b.

or more, Jesus was trying to avoid an arrest which He felt was imminent.

The main difficulty is to decide on what day of the week the Passover fell in the year in which our Lord was crucified. Unfortunately we cannot be quite certain on other grounds in what year this was, and so we cannot simply apply to the astronomers for the answer to our question. And even if we did know the year, there would still be some doubt, since the Jews may not always have been able to fix the beginning of their months at the right day; for to some extent they may still have had recourse to actual observation of the new moon, which might of course be obscured by clouds. The victims were slain on the afternoon of Nisan 14th, the meal was eaten on the same evening, that is, at the beginning of Nisan 15th, and the first fruits were offered in the Temple on Nisan 16th. Now according to Jn., our Lord was crucified on the afternoon of Nisan 14th, *before* the Passover Meal had been eaten by the Jews: but Mk., on the other hand, explicitly equates the Last Supper with the Passover Meal. These two chronologies cannot both be true: one at least must be wrong. We have seen that Mk. and Jn. agree that Jesus was crucified on a Friday afternoon: so the question is whether in the particular year Nisan 15th began late on Thursday, or late on Friday.⁴⁰

The relation between Mk. and Jn. may be shown in tabular form thus:

Mk's Date	The Events		Jn's Date
Nisan 14th	Thursday morning.	Arrangements made.	_____
Nisan 15th i.e. the Passover	{ Thursday evening.	Last Supper.	} Nisan 14th
	{ Friday morning.	Arrest of Jesus.	
	{ Friday afternoon.	Jesus before Pilate.	
		Crucifixion.	
		Burial.	
Nisan 16th	{ Friday evening to	The Sabbath.	} Nisan 15th.
	{ Saturday after- noon		
			i.e. the Passover
Nisan 17th	Sunday morning.	Discovery of the Empty Tomb.	} Nisan 16th

⁴⁰ It is not logically impossible that both Mk. and Jn. are wrong.

Jn's dating is quite consistent throughout: the Last Supper was "before the feast of the Passover";⁴¹ the Jews did not enter Pilate's palace on Friday morning "that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover";⁴² when Pilate sentenced Jesus to death, "it was the Preparation of the Passover";⁴³ and the Jews were especially anxious that the bodies should be taken down before sunset on Friday, "because the day of that sabbath was a high day."⁴⁴ Mk. 14:12-16, however, is equally emphatic on the other side: "on the first day of unleavened bread," when they sacrificed the Passover" (that is on Nisan 14th, in the afternoon of which the victims were slain), Jesus instructed His disciples how to prepare for the eating of the Passover; "and they made ready the Passover. And when it was evening, He cometh with the twelve: and as they sat and were eating . . ."

Now Mk's *own* account of the Passion contains indications that his equation of the Last Supper with the Passover meal is incorrect. For in Mk. 14:2 we read, "The chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take Jesus with subtilty and kill Him: for they said, '*Not during the feast*, lest haply there should be a tumult of the people.'" This proves that the Christians *believed* that the Jews had decided not to arrest Jesus during the feast: and presumably they believed this by inference from the *fact* that they did not do so; for it is hard to see how they could have direct information about the Jews' *councils*. 14:1 will be Mk's editorial introduction—"After two days was the Passover . . ."; and 14:2 which is probably incompatible with this will represent the older view of Mk's source, that the arrest of Jesus was not during the feast.

In the second place, while it is not certain that the events which Mk. describes would actually have been illegal on the day

⁴¹ Jn. 13:1.

⁴² Jn. 18:28.

⁴³ Jn. 19:14.

⁴⁴ Jn. 19:31.

⁴⁵ Probably at this time the feast of unleavened bread (originally for seven days) was held to include the day on which the victims were slain: cf. Josephus Ant. II. 15.1, *εορτήν αἰνοῦμεν ἐφ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ*.

of the Passover, yet some of them seem a little unlikely: the examination of a prisoner on that day would have presented difficulties, a regular trial such as Mk. has is even harder to envisage; Simon's arrival is ἀπ' ἀγροῦ⁴⁶—not necessarily from his work, but many have thought so; the police carry arms—which again seems strange, though it is possible; perhaps no one walks further than is legal, but many have found difficulties in this point.

The fact is, however, that except for the five verses 14:12–16 Mk's account nowhere *requires* the assumption that the events took place on the Passover. The Supper is not obviously the Passover Meal; only the hymn at the end, and the care taken to hold the meal in Jerusalem⁴⁷ support this equation; other features of the meal were characteristic of Jewish meals other than the Passover, while some features of the Passover, such as the lamb and bitter herbs, are not mentioned; it is strange that Mk. speaks of ἀpros rather than ἀζυμα; and he does not seem to have pictured the meal as lasting until midnight, although the Passover was required to do so.

Lk. does a little to reinforce the Marcan view that the Last Supper was the Passover: at 22:2 he omits the difficult words "Not during the feast"; he makes his account approximate more closely to an account of a Passover by placing the blessing of the Cup before the Breaking of the Bread: and at 22:15 he has the words "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer." But all who have any doubts about the hypothesis that Lk. is always following a special source wherever he diverges from Mk. will hesitate to attach much importance to his support of Mk. on this point: for it is not certain that he can be accepted as an independent witness.

There is some explicit symbolism in S. Paul which confirms Jn's dating. "Our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ," says S. Paul,⁴⁸ which fits the scheme whereby Jesus died while the paschal lambs were being slain. Similarly the Resurrection

⁴⁶ Mk. 15:21.

⁴⁷ But this appears in the section 14:12–16.

⁴⁸ 1 Cor. 5:7.

on Nisan 16th would coincide with the offering of the first-fruits in the Temple, a coincidence to which S. Paul draws attention: "But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first fruits of them that are asleep."⁴⁹ It might of course be argued that the symbolism was the *origin* of the Johannine "theory." But against this we have not only the inconsistency of Mk., but also the consideration that we have no evidence of any such manipulation of history in the interests of symbolism: we have symbolism without history in S. Paul, and history without at any rate *explicit* symbolism in Jn.; Jn's insistence on the accuracy of his chronology goes beyond what would have been required for critics to detect a subtle symbolic interpretation.

The Talmud⁵⁰ and the Quartodecimans testify to the truth of the Johannine view: their advocate Polycrates, according to Eusebius, said "We observe the exact day": and the churches of Asia Minor strongly maintained the tradition of observing the crucifixion on Nisan 14th, whereas Rome observes the appropriate Sunday as Easter Day, whatever the date: there was no question of observing Nisan 15th or 17th.

We may therefore conclude with some confidence that on this point Jn. is right and Mk. wrong: and we may suppose (with Dr. Branscomb) that it is Mk., not Jn., who has been led to alter the historical in the interests of the symbolical; to equate the Christian Eucharist and the Jewish Passover with its ideas of "the memorial of Israel's deliverance and the thought of the future reward which the first deliverance suggested."⁵¹

⁴⁹ I Cor. 15:20.

⁵⁰ Talmud, Sanh. 43a.

⁵¹ Branscomb, Commentary on S. Mark (p. 254). He points out that the alteration of the date would go unnoticed in the West, where the *Sunday* and not Nisan 16th was celebrated.

BOOK REVIEWS

Can Religious Education be Christian? By Harrison Elliott. Macmillan, 1940, pp. 338. \$2.50.

Dr. Harrison Elliott of Union Theological Seminary addresses himself in this book to a very serious tension that is developing in the Christian Church between the theologians and the educators. The tension is felt most poignantly by those in the field called Religious Education. The theologian deals with the Christian tradition and is interested in transmitting the values and truths found therein. The educator deals with the growing lives of people and is interested in their growth in Christian character.

During the so-called "liberal" era theology was at a discount and the Church looked for salvation to education. This hope was disappointed and now in the rise of the Neo-Orthodox school we see a return to a disparagement of education and an emphasis on the direct action of God on the human soul through the mediumship of the Christian tradition. Writers such as Reinhold Niebuhr and Emil Brunner represent this trend. They are free from fundamentalism, as far as the Bible is concerned, but they see in education the work of man and they stress in contrast to it the transcendental activity of God in saving man. This leads to the question as to whether Religious Education is or can be Christian at all. Is it not a humanistic device to put man's learning in the place of God's action?

Dr. Elliott replies both theologically and pedagogically to this question. He points out that revelation itself involves human reception and that the form of theological statement is always in terms of man's experience and need. And he urges that the Neo-Orthodox critics of Religious Education are ignorant of what modern educationalists are trying to do. These latter leaders are not trying to increase the intelligence of individuals in the faith that evil will thereby be overcome. They recognize that the greatest force in education is the active functioning of the person in cooperative endeavor in negotiating and doing something about the social situations of which they are a part. Modern Religious Education is not a series of pedagogical gadgets by which to tempt people to learn certain fixed lessons, nor is it a trust in mere human activities to produce Christian character. It is a recognition that life is formed in social effort and it is a strategy of providing such opportunities for social effort as will bring about the best results in the individual and in society. Modern Education does not hold such a pessimistic doctrine of man as is held by the Neo-Orthodox leaders. But neither does it hold such an optimistic doctrine of man as to ignore God. It proceeds in the faith that God mediates Himself to man not in theological formularies as such, but in cooperative social effort. Therefore it concerns itself primarily with the functioning of persons in such effort. The chief source of Christian Education is not the Bible as a book, nor the individual enlightenment by the Holy Spirit, but the actual experience entered into in Christian social effort.

The Christian family is the most potent agency in Christian Education.

Such an approach has a close affinity with a Catholic view of religion. In fact, Dr. Elliott said: "In its attitude toward human knowledge the modern religious education movement has, upon the whole, been in the Catholic rather than in Protestant tradition." But this is only true if by the Catholic tradition we mean the Church as a continuity of Christian social experience. As a matter of fact, there is as much fundamentalism in Catholicism toward tradition and dogma as there is in Protestantism toward the Bible. And modern education can work with neither of these.

The reviewer would hope that readers of this book will not be misled from its educational message by the type of liberal theology that Dr. Elliott holds. As a liberal, Dr. Elliott must speak in his own tongue. But he sometimes gives the impression that modern education can work only in that atmosphere. The truth is that modern educational philosophy and method belong in any religious effort which centers its attention on experience past or present rather than on truth not seen in relation to human experience. Dr. Elliott would not be at ease in using the words "once for all delivered to the saints." He would be inclined to emphasize the possibility of the new and unattained rather than the permanence of the ancient and the given. But if the "once for all given" is the root and beginning of a continuing experience then this fact *as experience* has a proper place in an experience-centered education. Indeed only such an educational method can lead us to appreciate the real character of the given.

There are tremendous and needed lessons in this book for all clergy. It is to be hoped that it will have a wide and understanding recognition.

D. A. MCGREGOR.

Finding God in Our Home. By Phyllis Newcomb Maramarco. Teacher's Book, pp. v + 163, \$1.00. Parent's and Pupil's Book, pp. 67, \$.60.

Discovering Our Church. By Marcella Prugh. Teacher's Book, pp. vii + 138, \$.90. Pupil's and Parent's Book, pp. v + 91, \$.60.

Worship and Worshipers in the Church. By Maurice Clarke. Teacher's Guide, pp. xii + 24. Pupil's Workbook, pp. iii + 111, \$.60. Louisville, Kentucky. Cloister Press, 1940.

These three new courses published by the Cloister Press are a welcome addition to the lesson material available for our Church Schools. Miss Maramarco's course is for the first year of kindergarten. It is divided into five units designed to relate in the child's mind the child's own home, Jesus's home in Nazareth and the church. It contains a great deal of helpful material and the teacher's book has many valuable suggestions both as to teaching this particular course and as to kindergarten methods in general. The suggested program for worship however seems thin. Even with very young children more church atmosphere could be introduced.

Miss Prugh's course is for children in the third grade. It is made up of six units designed to be covered in a year: *We Plan to Work Together*; *We Explore Our Church Building*; *We Use Our Church Building*; *We Serve in The Church*; *We Help The Church Send The Good News of Jesus to All The*

World; We Learn To Be Better Followers of Christ Every Day. The course is the outgrowth of many years of teaching at St. Mark's Church, Evanston, Illinois, and is one of the best courses for children of this age that has been published.

Worship and Worshipers in the Church is a course for children nearing the age of confirmation by The Rev. Maurice Clarke, the editor of the series. The course begins with some introductory matter about the church services, then by the way of a study of primitive worship, of Old Testament worship, and worship in Our Lord's time, comes around again to our own Christian worship with special emphasis on Confirmation and Holy Communion. The course provides an excellent work book. Work books, the author wisely reminds us, are not to make teaching easier but to make learning more interesting.

There is a very definite educational philosophy behind these courses and a very definite attempt to lead the growing child into a deeper knowledge of God and the Church and into helpful attitudes toward other people by helping him interpret his everyday experiences in terms of the life of Jesus and the teachings of the Church. Of special interest is the insistence all through that the parents have a part in the religious training of the child.

Any of these courses would be helpful in any Church School if put into the hands of a teacher who took her teaching seriously and was willing to do some work. But even if a church school does not find it practical to use these courses in the curriculum, one set of the books might well be added to the Church School Library that teachers might get the benefit of the many stimulating suggestions they contain—suggestions which would be valuable to any teacher teaching any course.

C. L. STREET.

Living Religions and a World Faith. By William E. Hocking. Macmillan, 1940, pp. 12 + 292. \$2.50.

This book has the religious insight, the maturity and the wisdom that we have learned to expect from Dr. Hocking. It has clarity which derives from the intellectual discipline and deep religion so characteristic of the author. It has information of many kinds used in a brilliant way. These elements alone make the book very valuable.

Religion is conceived in a broad fashion so that Professor Hocking is able to interpret much of our world to itself in religious terms. Humanism, Atheism, "modernity" and ethical problems are discussed to show an emerging and elemental natural religion which has recovered Supernature. This takes its place alongside of the Oriental religions and Christianity as a potential candidate for inclusion in the world faith.

The world faith of a possible future is not a eclectic religion, nor is it a synthesis which attempts to unite all the religions in one vast harmony. This type of approach, typified by the Parliament of Religions, is regarded as artificial. There is a legitimate synthesis of religions, however, which takes place inevitably when two or more living religions touch. This synthesis is "growth through recognizing one's proper food." It has criteria: (1) That a religion

shall have individuality and maintain it through its growth. (2) That new elements must be assimilated into the organism of the living religion. (3) That accretions must be consistent with the nature of the religion.

Legitimate synthesis, therefore, cannot be the way to a world faith. It is only a preparatory stage since it does not produce one universal religion but expands to the full each of the developing and interacting religions. The world faith, if it is to be, must come by *Reconception*. Reconception may occur when two or more religions have lived together and thought together in such a way as to break through to a new level of understanding themselves, a level which includes and transforms them. If this were to occur, Professor Hocking believes that the Christ would become a universally recognized symbol and that Jesus would be understood as its embodiment.

"As a privilege, the Christ symbol 'will draw all men'; as a threat, never. But as the meaning of this symbol becomes purified of partisanship and folly, rejection becomes arbitrary, its temper will pass, and the perfect interpretation of the human heart will assume its due place. When *In hoc signo* ceases to be a battle cry, it will ascend as token of another conquest, the conquest of estrangement among the seekers of God" (p. 269).

This is a book to live and think with for a long time. It raises many questions. I find my greatest question directed toward the implicit doctrine of man which nowhere necessitates a discussion of redemption. Dr. Hocking's discussion of Dr. Hendrick Kraemer's position (and Karl Barth's) affords an excellent point for conversation about Revelation. He promises a book on the nature of Christianity—which will illumine these points, it is to be hoped.

A. T. MOLLEGEN.

Platonismus und Prophetismus. By Joh. Hessen. Munich: Reinhardt, 1940, pp. 240. RM 4.80; linen 6.50.

The book of Professor Johannes Hessen attempts a comparison between the intellectual structure of Platonism and Prophetism. The importance of the task becomes obvious in the second part of the book where the author shows that from early Christianity through Augustine, Thomas, Luther etc. to the present dialectic theology and philosophy of existence the contrast and the unity of prophetic and Platonic elements was a main subject of Christian theology. He rightly concludes that no Christian theology is possible if either of these elements is entirely eliminated.

In the first and larger part Hessen shows the difference in the structure of thought of Platonism and Prophetism with respect to the idea of God, to the notion of the world, to the doctrine of man. Rich and interesting material is used in order to make clear the difference of the two attitudes on innumerable special points. But in no case are the points of comparison taken in isolation. They are always understood as the expression of a fundamental structural contrast. The great value of the book lies in this method of "*Gestaltschau*" (intuition of structures). It may be that in some cases the difference is over-emphasized and the structural unity of each of these types exaggerated. This is unavoidable in all typological descriptions. The individual reality is richer

than the typological structure for all those who deal with the ancient world from the point of view of the conflux of Hebrew and Hellenic elements and for all those who participate in the present discussion about new ways in Systematic Theology. The book of Hessen is tremendously helpful. It should be in the hands of all American students in those realms and for this purpose it should be made available in English.

PAUL TILlich.

Greek Popular Religion. By Martin P. Nilsson. Columbia Univ. Press, 1940, pp. xviii + 166. Ill. \$2.50.

The "American Lectures on the History of Religions" (1896-1916) have been revived under the sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies. The present work is Vol. I of the new series. Dr. Nilsson, Sometime Rector of the University of Lund, gave the lectures in 1939 at various colleges, universities, and seminaries, including our own Kenyon College.

It is more generally recognized now than formerly that "Greek Religion" included far more than the ideas and rites reflected in Homer and other poets, and that the literary expression of Greek religion was only partial and fragmentary. (The same principle holds true of other religions, including the Hebrew, Jewish, and early Christian: the literary documents presuppose, they do not fully describe or expound the religion of the people.)

Dr. Nilsson takes us at once to the Greek countryside, and we follow the peasant in his round of daily toil from dawn to dusk. Religion meets us everywhere—for it was rooted in the soil and it met the needs of an agricultural people for whom the harvest and the herd or flock were their chief concern. So basic was this folk religion that it long survived the disappearance of the great Olympian deities; many of the survivals are still to be encountered in rural parts of modern Greece.

The author shows how this folk religion underlay the artistic, literary, philosophic elaboration of the traditional myths. Zeus was *chthonios*, e.g., not because he came from the nether world, but because he was *herkeios*, the protector of the family fence, the guardian of the house; so also was the family snake the house's protector—and naturally the two were identified.

For the New Testament student, the most important chapter is the one on 'The Religion of Eleusis.' This too was originally an agricultural rite, connected with the fall sowing. (The later reports, e.g. by Clement of Alexandria, are based upon hearsay, probably confuse it to some extent with other mysteries, and anyway relate only to the preparatory ceremony, not to the final initiation.) The great thing about the Eleusinian religion was not its original meaning but its adaptation to later needs, the sublimation and spiritualization it underwent through the centuries. "The peasant loved peace. In war his fields were burned and his trees cut down. Hesiod says that for the wild beasts the law is to eat each other, but Zeus has given justice to man. Hesiod preaches labor, through which man earns his livelihood, and justice, which assures him of the fruits of his labor. Hesiod has abandoned the ideal of the warring Homeric knights and embraced a new, quite contrasted ideal of peace and

justice created by agriculture. Its hero is the Eleusinian Triptolemos. This is a complete revolution in moral ideals . . . I venture to speak of an Elusinian piety founded on this idea that agriculture created a civilized and peaceful life worthy of human beings. Aristophanes speaks of it in some remarkable verses of his comedy *The Frogs*. The mystae sing: 'The sun and the gay light are only for us who are initiated and live a pious life in regard to foreigners and private persons' (pp. 57f.).

It was this higher morality, relatively to foreigners and slaves, and further a promise of a better lot in the life to come, as seen in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter 480ff. and in Pindar, Frag. 137, that characterize the higher development of the religion of Eleusis. It was no small achievement, and had an important part in the preparation for the Gospel. But it was not a dogmatic religion: "There were no doctrines . . . but only some simple fundamental ideas about life and death as symbolized in the springing up of the new crop from the old. [Cf. Jn. 12:24.] Every age might interpret these according to its own propensities. Thus the persistence of the most venerable religion of ancient Greece is explained. Its power was a result of the absence of dogmas and of its close connection with the deepest longings of the human soul" (p. 63).

The book sets a very high standard for the new series which it heads.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

An Introduction to Philo Judaeus. By Erwin R. Goodenough. Yale Univ. Press, 1940, pp. xii + 223. \$2.75.

The importance of Philo is steadily increasing—not only for a thorough knowledge of first-century Judaism, especially in the Diaspora, but an understanding of the rise of Christianity. The parallels between Philo and the Fourth Gospel, the Epistle to Hebrews, and even to passages in St. Paul have long been recognized and are cited in all the commentaries. But it is more than similarity in language or ideas that is significant: the whole structure of Philo's thought, his relation to traditional Judaism, his adoption of Hellenistic religious and philosophic doctrines and in large measure of the Greek point of view, in brief his "Hellenization" of Judaism and his representation of it as the true philosophy—all this is significant for the parallel Hellenization of Christianity (i.e. of the Gospel of Jesus and of the Apostles) which was even then, in the thirties and forties, taking place in Syria and perhaps Asia Minor. As Dr. Goodenough insists, "what we need is not parallels but bridges, demonstration of how ideas could have reached and become incorporated into early Christianity from sources other than orthodox Judaism and the direct teachings of Jesus." Philo, in whom the Alexandrian "school" reached its culmination, represented a Judaism with not only "a strong sense of orthodoxy as to what could be assimilated and what not" but one with amazing resemblances to Christianity in its basic points of view, methodology, and contacts with paganism.

Professor Goodenough is one of the world's leading authorities on Philo. His earlier works, *By Light, Light*, and *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, not to mention other books and a number of articles in learned journals, lead us to welcome this compact, "popular" account of Philo's thought. Perhaps the

greatest value of the work is the guidance it offers the student in beginning the study of Philo. The chapter on Method and the one on Philo's Writings should be read by every New Testament student: the method here recommended for studying Philo is, *mutatis mutandis*, the right method in studying the New Testament (especially Paul).

The treatment of Philo's doctrine of the Logos is most important. No English word is adequate for the conception of the "Stream from God": we shall have to learn to use the untranslated term "Logos," rather than "word." On the question of personality, "if we are to follow Philo rather than our own categories we shall have to learn with him to answer . . . Yes and No simultaneously. If Philo were asked the question he would undoubtedly have fallen back into his purer metaphysics and denied that the Logos was anything but the flow of divine Reality, and that the Logos had no more reality in itself than has a ray of sunshine apart from the sun. Yet his soul was so warmed by the Logos-ray of God that he often thought of that ray as a thing in itself, something which could be made vivid by personification, even a rudimentary mythology, as he tried to express the fulness of his thought and experience. . . . He was not even committed to the term Logos: Sophia or Virtue would do just as well" (p. 134). In general, Philo's thought is far more Platonic than Stoic (p. 146), not only in his metaphysics but also in his ethics (ch. vi)—contrary to much current writing on the subject.

The final chapter deals with Philo the Mystic. Here Dr. Goodenough restates briefly and clearly his view that Philo presents Judaism as a "Mystery," and answers those critics who understood him to maintain that Philo viewed Judaism as "a mystery religion." In justification of the author's use of *mystêrion*, one need not have gone beyond the New Testament (e.g. Rom. 16:25). The evidence for Philo's representation of Judaism under this guise is quite convincing; and if it was not a "Mystery," what other term is there for it?

The exposition of Philo given in this short and interesting book is most valuable—the teacher of New Testament and of early Church History now has a work to place in his students' hands which they will read and can understand. If there is any criticism to make, it is only this: Was not the Jewish Wisdom literature, especially the Alexandrian, somewhat more important in Philo's development? (e.g. pp. 159f.: "nothing in Jewish tradition had made virtue a thing in itself . . ."). Further, is not the transition from Philo's Judaism to Early Christianity made too simple and direct (pp. 210f.)? From Philo's Judaism to St. Paul, to the Fourth Gospel, is easy enough, perhaps; but not to pre-Pauline Christianity, or to the type of Christianity represented in its later development by the Synoptic Gospels. And Christianity did not begin with Philo, or with Philo's type of Judaism: it began with a Christology rooted in Palestinian Messianism and in the conviction of Jesus' Resurrection and Exaltation.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Ephesian Tradition. By H. E. Dana. Kansas City Seminary Press, 1940, pp. 175. \$1.00.

The subtitle of this work, which explains "The Ephesian tradition" as "an oral source of the Fourth Gospel," states President Dana's thesis. The personal element that the Evangelist contributed to his Gospel is not very great; long before he wrote it its concepts and in large measure even its wording had taken shape in the oral teaching and preaching of Christian leaders in Ephesus. They had inherited a Palestinian tradition, with a Pauline coloring superadded; this, further colored by Ephesian concepts, they "wrought out in their ministry to and in cooperation with the Asian churches across the span of at least a generation" (pp. 115-116). For proof of his thesis Dr. Dana relies chiefly on form-criticism. It has been for some years an axiom of the form critics that John cannot be analyzed into oral pericopes but this axiom he denies; in his sixth chapter (pp. 63-93) he goes through the Gospel in detail, pointing out that the various discourses and controversies are all built around sections bearing every mark of the corresponding Synoptic material; even chapters 14-16 ought to be "recognized as a compilation of several discourse pericopae from tradition" (p. 73). He will therefore allow no distinction between an "author" and an "editor" of John; we should say instead "Ephesian tradition" and "author" (p. 74). As a corollary, he will admit no displacements in the Gospel; every section is in the position the author wished it to have and must be understood in that place, not somewhere else.

The book is very clearly written and the argument is easy to follow: in particular the diagrams on pages 131 and 149 summarize excellently the author's conclusions as regards the development of the various traditions. The handling of form criticism—often egregiously abused nowadays—is firm and competent. And what he says about the existence of an Ephesian tradition that existed quite apart from the Evangelist is important; no student of the Johannine problem should neglect this book.

The argument, however, does not consider all the facts. For instance, while 5:1-9 has the general pericope form, its contents are not those of oral tradition; this would not give the details of the Bethesda legend which make the story assert that Jesus did only what the waters of the pool might have done equally well! This element, which cannot be removed from the section, is characteristic of the Evangelist's contempt for the evidential value of physical miracles; the pericope form is a deliberate copying of the traditional type, not the type itself. The real meaning of 5:1-9, indeed, does not appear until the whole of 5:1-18 is read and the first nine verses never existed independently of the last nine. The same is true of 9:1-7; the cure—which is more than half allegory—is the mere introduction to the rest of the chapter, which is an indivisible unit.

We cannot, moreover, think of the Fourth Evangelist as a mere recorder of the surrounding tradition. Undoubtedly he did not write in complete independence of Christian thought in Ephesus—but can we conceive that he was not himself the source of much of that thought? Could he have worked anywhere without impressing his personality on all who surrounded him? It is a real lack in Dr. Dana's book that the individual outlook of "John" is not

evaluated as a most vital factor in his work, just as in some Synoptic form criticism the individuality of Jesus is submerged in impersonal "tradition." And why is Dr. Dana so confident that the Gospel is free from editorial touches? In this regard, as well as in others, he would have learned much from Dr. Bultmann's commentary, which he had not used.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON.

A Short History of Christianity. By M. H. Shepherd, Jr., J. T. McNeil, M. Spinka, W. E. Garrison, W. W. Sweet, and A. G. Baker. Edited by A. G. Baker. University of Chicago Press, 1940, pp. vii + 279. \$2.00.

This is a popular history written for "the rank and file of church members" who, it is rightly assumed, are none too familiar with "the church as a historical religious movement." It is planned for the "reader who has only a limited time at his disposal." It is "also designed as a textbook for study classes."

In addition to treatments of early, medieval, reformation, and modern European church history, there are sections on the Eastern Churches, on Christianity in the United States and in Latin America, and on modern world missions.

Like many a book by several authors the treatment is uneven. Of its eight chapters the first two, the fifth, and the last two (the Early Church, the Eastern Churches, American Christianity, and world missions) seem to this reviewer to meet most adequately the demands of popular presentation: dates are given sparingly, much detail is omitted, unexplained events and persons are not introduced, and only the more important matters are presented. In the other chapters one feels that the authors were so keen to get in everything that they mention not a few persons and movements which they have not space to identify or explain. For instance, within eight lines (on p. 184) Quietism, Molinos, Mme. Guyon, Fenelon, the cult of the Sacred Heart, Jansenism and its conflict with the Jesuits, Pascal, and Port Royal are all alluded to, but no further enlightenment on any of these matters is given, except that Quietism is defined vaguely as "a mystical movement," and Jansenism as "a revival of Augustinian theology"; but neither mysticism nor Augustinian theology is explained anywhere in the book. Luther and Zwingli's disagreement over the sacrament of the altar is twice noted (pp. 106, 110) but nowhere is there the slightest hint of why they differed or what the views of either of them were on the matter.

In some instances one is tempted to question the proportionate amount of space allotted to certain subjects. John Wesley and the Methodist Revival are given half a page, while the Russian Patriarch Nikon occupies a whole page, Socinus two pages, and the Anabaptists of the 16th century two and a half pages. Anglicanism subsequent to the Reformation gets but little notice and that not always accurate. Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying* is listed as a "piece of Puritan Literature"; the entire Evangelical Movement in the Church of England is disposed of in a line and a half; and the Oxford Movement is simply mentioned in passing, along with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the decree of Papal Infallibility, and the shrine of Our

Lady of Lourdes, as one of the "high points" in modern Roman Catholic history!

The book will hardly attain popularity as a text book among Episcopalians; yet it might be good for our souls to read it. It would help us to see ourselves as others see us, or rather as others ignore us, and at the same time we would learn a lot besides, told on the whole in a lively and interesting fashion.

J. A. MULLER.

Theologia Fundamentalis. By A. C. Cotter. Weston, Mass.: Weston College, 1940, pp. 739. \$3.50.

We have here a volume designed to serve as a textbook of theology in Roman Seminaries. Like most textbooks in such subjects, it is not very interesting; it is, however, lucid. We cannot fancy this book producing the passion for orthodox doctrine which characterized an Athanasius, but it ought to prevent the heresy of an Arius.

The method employed is strictly scholastic. Those steeped in more modern and "progressive" theories of education might well question whether the student could not profitably figure out a few of the arguments for himself, rather than have everything neatly prepared for him. We also question whether some of the objections which, here and there throughout the book, are silenced with "terrible logic" would ever come up in the present day.

This book can have little value for one not owning obedience to the See of Rome, since both its language (Latin) and its theology render it strictly a product of a world in which Roman theologians (with almost no exceptions) wander alone. A disproportionate amount of time and space are (we believe) devoted to the subject of the Church. The impression upon one who is not a Romanist is that God has been shoved aside, figuratively speaking, to make room for an exposition of the peculiar Roman doctrine of the Catholic Church, which adherents of that belief ought not to need, and which few, if any, who deny it will ever see.

Despite all this, the volume is of a convenient size, and ought to be most useful for the purpose for which it was written. The Latin style is simple, the vocabulary direct—both qualities which even Roman Seminarists ought to appreciate.

Any Non-Roman Catholic or Protestant reader ought to bear well in mind, while reading this book, (a) the author's aim, which was to produce a textbook in the scholastic style, and (b) his peculiar bias, the Roman doctrine of the Church; so that he may be prevented from completely condemning a book which very likely will be most effective in accomplishing what it sets out to do; viz., produce loyal priests of the Latin Rite.

E. J. TEMPLETON.

Father Huntington. Founder of the Order of the Holy Cross. By Vida D. Scudder. Dutton, 1940, pp. 375. \$3.50.

One who undertakes to write the biography of a contemporary inevitably fails to satisfy the desires of many. As was said, shortly after the death of

Fr. Huntington, "One of his remarkable qualities was his many-sidedness, which resulted in each person who knew him closely having his or her particular memory of him in a way unique for each. It seems impossible for any one person to write his biography" (quoted p. 323). Miss Scudder has naturally stressed the activity most interesting to herself, that in social questions, single tax etc., and thereby has presented a side of his interests less well-known to many, and of value in painting the portrait of her subject. She has of course not confined herself to this aspect of Fr. Huntington's life; but it is the aspect which predominates. This is unfortunate, for it seems unlikely that another Life on as large a scale will ever be produced.

In any case, the biographer's task would be a difficult one. The figure portrayed was not only "romantic and noble" (p. 20), "but no man of his generation had more conscious and contagious experience of fellowship with the Living God" (p. 65). No one who came into contact with Fr. Huntington would doubt the truth of this latter statement; but it was something which must be felt, it is incapable of expression on the printed page. A more copious supply of anecdotes of personal contacts might have helped to make this man, "who lived in the immediate Presence of God" (p. 255), more real to those who did not have the privilege of personal acquaintance. More illustrations would have been useful; there is only one, that best known of the pictures of Fr. Huntington. All must be grateful, however, to Miss Scudder for her attempt; complete success was more than could be expected, and she has made a real contribution towards the understanding of one who played an outstanding part in the life of the Church of his generation.

FRANK H. HALLOCK.

Is God Emeritus? By Shailer Mathews. Macmillan, 1940, pp. ix + 93. \$1.50.

This little volume is regarded by its author as a continuation of the line of theistic thought developed in his *Growth of the Idea of God*. There is, I believe, nothing strictly new in the later work. It is rather a concise and ripe presentation of the essential thought of an eminent teacher and theologian who is now "Emeritus."

The fundamental contention of Dean Mathews is that the term God is not existential but symbolic. God is not a personal being or spirit ontologically distinct from the world but is a symbol for the personality-producing forces of the universe, which constitute the significant portion of man's environment. The existential God, we are told, is *emeritus*. Once he was living for men. They thought of him as Father, Monarch, Eternal Thinker. This time is past. But if we can adjust ourselves to the use of the traditional term as a convenient and religiously evocative mode of designating the forces of our cosmic environment which have produced personality and with which persons are in necessary contact, we have the essence of religion and there is no reason to conclude, as many people have concluded, that God is *emeritus*.

Such a thesis raises the most basic problems of theology and philosophy. They cannot be discussed in a review of this kind. I may be permitted, however, two or three critical observations and one encomium.

I am struck by the ahistorical character of Mathew's theological thinking. It seems to have two sources: personal religion pragmatically approached and science. History seems to count for little, save as a compendium of object lessons in what to avoid. One cannot help wondering, however, whether his view of history in relation to theology (i.e. as the matrix at any given time of social experience which becomes the content of religious ideas) does not condemn to relativity his own interpretation in terms of science. Or is he influenced by a doctrine of progress, which is actually a secularization of Biblical theology, so that it is possible to hold that as a result of modern science the chain of historical relativity obtaining throughout the past has been broken? This of course raises the whole question of the implications of a teleological view of the world. It raises also the critical problem of the relation of the philosophy of history to the philosophy of nature.

Another point has reference to the fact that Mathew's theism is evidently of the naturalistic variety and yet is non-monistic: is not based upon an identification of God and Nature, in the manner of the older theistic naturalism. His thought is, so to speak, a descendant of Zoroastrianism rather than of Stoicism or Spinozism. Mathews, it is true, does not explicitly make this distinction in types of naturalism, but I am sure that it is implied. The very difficult question which his type of theistic theory gives rise to is, What ground is there for preferring as more real the side of nature which we may call personality-producing? I was very impressed when in 1939 in personal conversation two graduates of one of the Fuehrer schools of the Third Reich insisted that their philosophy was theistic but based on a repudiation of two concepts, the personality of God, and sin. Instead they believed in receiving the laws of Nature as the laws of God and obeying them as commandments. Is there not a connexion between this type of naturalism and the modernism of which Dean Mathews is so distinguished an exponent?

Having raised such questions, which do seem tremendously important, I should like to conclude by noting the extremely discerning and moving character of Mathew's chapter "Jesus and God." This part of his discussion made me feel closer to him than I should have felt on the basis of the exposition of the existential and symbolic concepts of God alone. I feel however that dogma is as essential today as it was in the fourth century, and that only a very powerful dogma can stand up in the contemporary strife of ideas, creeds, and myths. Such a dogma can only be based on the moral certainty that Jesus represents not a "sport" of evolution, an accident of the one substance or reality of the world, but the self-manifestation of ultimate existential being and power.

CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Biblical

How to Read the Bible. By Julian Price Love. Macmillan, 1940, pp. x + 204. \$2.00.

The purpose of this book by the Professor of English Bible at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary is to help the average lay person read the Bible more intelligently and with more enjoyment. It provides notes on the history and background of the different books that go to make up the Bible, and suggests a number of readings from the several books, which the author calls "units of thought," with a certain amount of explanation of each unit. The last chapters of the book discuss the meaning of the Bible for everyday life. Certainly present day Christians should read and study the Bible more than they do. This book, thoroughly modern and at the same time thoroughly reverent, should encourage some of them to do so.

C. L. S.

The Sermon on the Mount. By Martin Dibelius. Scribner, 1940, pp. vi + 137. \$1.50.

Using the methods of Form Criticism, the author examines Matt. v-vii to discover what Jesus said, what the sayings meant to the hearers, and in what manner these sayings were used by the post-Easter church. He concludes that the purpose of the writer of Matthew is to provide the Christian communities with a summary of Christ's teaching, which became necessary but which was not the primary intention of Jesus—whose sole purpose was to proclaim the pure will of God. This pure will of God is not dependent on current world conditions either then or now. On the whole the Sermon on the Mount is a collection of "radical absolute commands and sayings."

The fact that there is so great a gap between these sayings and their practical application reveals the sayings as God's judgment of us; and this judgment is evident in the modern world where power and money are the dominant forces and men are immersed in the struggle for a livelihood. Because the church has been too closely associated with the powers of this world it has been unable to stop this secularisation and in consequence the new radical movements have been antagonistic to the church.

But in spite of the fact that it is not possible to do the pure will of God in the world order, the task of Christians is nevertheless to proclaim as ambassadors God's will for men, not in order to improve men but to transform them; for we are not able to perform the will of God, but we are able to be transformed by it.

J. S. H.

The New Testament. Extra Wide Margin Edition. New York: American Bible Society, 1940, pp. 615. \$2.00.

This edition of the New Testament will certainly prove a great boon to all Biblical students in and out of seminary—to pastors, church school teachers, laymen who make a regular study of the New Testament, in fact all persons who are concerned with understanding and interpreting the Scriptures—for it is a wide margin edition of the American Standard Revised Version printed on paper which will take ink, bound in signatures and slotted for insertion in standard notebook covers (8½" by 11"). Additional loose leaf pages may be inserted. There is ample room for notes and it is the best New Testament we have seen for class-room purposes.

Aside from the top and bottom of each page, which are free for notes, the "margin" is five inches wide!

The American Bible Society printed this edition in response to a request from the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis and the National Association of Biblical Instructors.

F. C. G.

A Greek-English Lexicon. Compiled by Henry George Liddell . . . and Robert Scott . . . New edition . . . by Henry Stuart Jones . . . with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie . . . and with the co-operation of many scholars. Part 10: *tragein-ôôdês*. Oxford University Press, 1940, pp. xlviii + pp. 1809-2111. \$3.50.

The new Liddell and Scott, begun in 1925, is now complete! The final installment contains 48 pages of preliminary matter (including lists of authors and works quoted or cited) and 69 pages of Addenda and Corrigenda. The publishers offer the completed work bound in two volumes, and binding covers may be had by those who wish to bind up the parts.

It need scarcely be said that the work is indispensable, and should be in every library where classical texts are housed and read. It ought also to be used by those who study the New Testament, the Septuagint, or early Christian literature. Reviews and notes printed in this REVIEW since 1925 have emphasized the importance of the revised edition.

One must congratulate the publishers upon the conclusion of this great undertaking—carried on by them to completion after the death of both editors. Sir H. S. Jones died in 1939, Mr. R. McKenzie in 1937.

It is remarkable that the work has been finished under the adverse conditions of war, and especially of the kind of war—aerial bombardment—that Hitler has loosed against Great Britain. But it is like the British to carry on, however adverse the surrounding conditions. The new Lexicon is a great work of scholarship; it is equally a magnificent product of indomitable British spirit. We are grateful for both.

F. C. G.

Historical

Militant in Earth: Twenty Centuries of the Spread of Christianity. By Edward Rochie Hardy, Jr. Oxford University Press, 1940, pp. vii + 255. \$3.00.

Those who direct students in Christian Missions often have difficulty in recommending satisfactory reading on the historical side. Some otherwise

excellent books are soggy with statistics; some are constructed on a geographical plan which tends to conceal the onward march of the Church and the world-progress of the Gospel. Dr. Hardy's volume has neither of these defects. It is scholarly, luminous, well-balanced. In six chapters it traces the advance of the Christian frontier from the Jerusalem Apostolic Council to the Madras Conference. It notes the adaptation of strategy and tactics to changing circumstances. It is replete with insights and brightened here and there with touches of humor. Its underlying depth of learning becomes increasingly evident on closer acquaintance, yet need cause no dismay. All in all, it is pretty nearly the sort of book some of us have been wishing for. The price may seem high, but is amply justified by the attractive format. One of its chief merits is the vivid impression it conveys of spiritual energy thrusting forward against many obstacles to naturalize heavenly citizenship in human societies.

P. V. N.

The Letters of Saint Boniface. By Ephraim Emerton. Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 204. \$3.00.

A much needed translation into English of the correspondence of Saint Boniface, together with an excellent introduction on that Apostle's relationships with the Frankish Church and State and with the Holy See under three Popes, Gregory II and III and Zacharias. Of especial interest is the letter of Gregory II to Boniface entrusting him with the mission of the heathen (Germans). The letter shows that Gregory II understood thoroughly the aims and policies of his illustrious predecessor Gregory the Great. All the claims of Rome are to be found in these instructions of the year 719. This loyalty of Boniface to the See of Peter is seen also in his oath on becoming Bishop in 722 and in the Papacy's gift to him of the pallium some ten years later.

J. S. H.

The Church Manual of Olavus Petri. Translated from the Swedish, with Introduction and Notes, by O. V. Anderson. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Book Concern, 1940, pp. 63. 50 cts.

Olavus Petri, probably the outstanding theologian of the Swedish reformation, and certainly its ripest liturgical scholar, published his vernacular Manual in 1529—the first of its kind in the Protestant world. It contains the Occasional Offices for Baptism, Matrimony, Churching of Women, Visitation of the Sick, and Burial, with a Preface and a Conclusion setting forth Petri's principles of liturgical reform. A comparison with the corresponding parts of the Anglican Prayer Book—twenty years later than Petri's Manual—is rewarding. Each has its points of greater conservatism, but common to both is the large didactic element, since both reforming groups felt the necessity of indoctrinating the people with evangelical ideas.

P. V. N.

The Scottish Metrical Psalter of 1650. A Revision by Nichol Grieve. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Scribner, 1940, pp. 156. \$.75.

A revision of the Scottish Psalter which eliminates many of the more crude and uncouth phrases that are found in the old metrical Psalter. Imprecatory Psalms and portions of Psalms are omitted.

D. A. MCG.

Anglican Humanitarianism in Colonial New York. By F. J. Klingberg. Philadelphia: The Church Historical Society, 1940, pp. x + 295. \$3.00.

This book is divided into three main sections: Book I contains the author's treatment of his subject; Book II is a reprint of three sermons delivered before the S. P. G. and selected because of their bearing on the subject in hand; and Book III presents to the reader a significant selected bibliography. Professor Klingberg has brought together in this study a large mass of material collected from various sources, many of them not easily accessible to the average student of American Church History. His footnotes are extremely full and complete. Anyone interested in the subject will be sure to find the present volume a valuable addition to his library.

E. J. T.

Homiletic and Pastoral

A Faith to Affirm. By James Gordon Gilkey. Macmillan, 1940, pp. ix + 170. \$1.75.

This book should be read by all of us who are responsible to some classical form of Christianity. To read it is a chastening experience. It makes us know with what little relevance we interpret Christian symbols to many persons. It makes us aware, also, of the predicament which a large area of American life must share with Dr. Gilkey since it approves his preaching.

The author rejects all New Testament and creedal Christology as trappings of the past no longer acceptable to intelligent men. Jesus was probably a man and nothing more, his death was pure tragedy, he lives—as do other men—a life of growth and development after death. Jesus' meaning lies in his courageous life and in a central core of teaching that God is love, that all men are God's children, and that they ought to show kindness to one another.

The book's penetration of the complexity of life and its understanding of ethics is reflected in the process by which it arrives at the conclusion that America should not take part in foreign wars. The principle is that "duties to individuals near at hand usually take precedence over duties to individuals at a distance."

A. T. M.

Not Alone. By Joseph R. Sizoo. Macmillan, 1940, pp. 99. \$1.25.

It is possible to find some technical flaws in these sermons. On both pages 2 and 79, those who worship at the altar of self-sufficiency find that the incense smoke blows into their faces and blinds their vision. Rev. 4:11 is used curiously (p. 28), and one wonders why it is prussic, i.e. hydrocyanic acid, which is poured on Job's scars. This is not a criticism of Dr. Sizoo, for most volumes of sermons which come from the press nowadays exhibit such imperfections. The important thing is that these chapters have freshness, vividness, insight, and emotional power. Unlike so many preachers, Dr. Sizoo is not dominated by his illustrations but makes them organic to his message, and they are apt. The strongest sermons in the book are those which deal with the present crisis: "We Are Not Alone," "Purpose for Living," "The Weakness of Strength," and "Building on Risks." He is evidently no pacifist, but believes that Christians must do immensely more than prepare to get in this war.

S. E. J.

Marriage. By William Lyon Phelps. Dutton, 1940, pp. 56. \$1.00.

This is an amplification of Professor Phelps's splendid article in *Good Housekeeping*. In a day when professors of sociology emphasize—no doubt quite rightly—the importance of sex education, financial planning and "personality adjustment" in preparation for marriage, it is refreshing to hear Billy Phelps say that character and religion are more important than these other things. One need scarcely add that he says it all beautifully and absorbingly. The young man or young woman who picks up the booklet will not lay it down and will be the better for having read it. S. E. J.

A Laymen's Guide to Churchmanship. By I. Abbott Morton. Denver: Criterion Press, 1940, pp. 21. \$.25.

A little book emphasizing the importance of lay activity in the Church. Some valuable lists of functions that laymen can perform and a self-rating scale by which a layman can test his own value as a Churchman. D. A. MCG.

General

American Mirror. By Halford E. Luccock. New York: Macmillan, 1940, pp. vi + 300. \$2.50.

Everything that Dr. Luccock writes is worth reading and can be read with delight, for no man is a greater master of the pithy phrase that exactly fits the case. The present volume is a survey of American literature from 1930 to 1940, studied chiefly as a manifestation of underlying tendencies, so that literary history constantly passes into cultural history and—especially—into cultural criticism. For the most part he stands outside what he records and speaks as an objective observer; even in his chapter "Religion—Implicit and Explicit" only those who know his other work will recognize where his sympathies lie. He is, however, Professor of Homiletics at Yale and his book is a direct contribution to his own field. For the preacher's business is to expound his text to his people, so that only the preacher who knows his people as well as his text can really do his work. B. S. E.

As a Flame Springs. By James Patton McCormick. Scribner, 1940, pp. xii + 356. \$2.75.

"The Romance of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning." A generation ago every young preacher was counselled to study Browning—and the advice is still good. His manly, robust poetry was the voice of enlightened, liberal Christianity, combined with modern Anglo-Saxon culture. It gave adequate recognition to the classical heritage, which Christianity has kept alive even while criticizing its shortcomings; while the ruddy splendor of the Mediaeval achievement was equally honored. Robert Browning was undeniably a Christian poet—one for whom liberal, Victorian Protestantism was modified and enriched by a genuine appreciation of the great tradition which lay behind Protestantism in the earlier religious history of Europe.

Here the poetry of both the Brownings is studied in relation to their life together as man and wife. And if it turns out that they were not quite so "liberal" as we thought thirty years ago, their poetry is still worthy of study—and quotation. For the church it not altogether "liberal" these days, either. It now stresses once again the age-old description of human nature:

'Tis the faith that launched point-blank her dart
At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,
The Corruption of Man's Heart.

Still, as Dr. McCormick points out, "Browning's opinions of science and higher criticism were amateurish" (p. 319)—his purely artistic poetry was vastly superior to his controversial. In fact, "the weakness of his intellectual approach to life came as a result of his amateurism. He was an amateur student, philosopher, psychologist, painter, collector, business man—everything except poet. He knew enough to see that every problem had two sides; he seldom was able to carry his investigations to the point where he could decide which one of these was most true When Browning finally discovered that this method of weighing good and evil led to a similar irresolution, when he found that he could not hate evil as he ought to, he began to ignore the bewildering dictates of his mind for the simpler faiths of his imagination" (p. 322).

The book is extremely interesting, and the religious and theological ideas of the Brownings receive a very penetrating, sympathetic, and yet critical appraisal.

F. C. G.

So Falls The Elm Tree. By John Louis Bonn. Macmillan, 1940, pp. vii + 287. \$2.50.

This is the story of the life of Mother Ann Valencia, founder of Saint Francis Hospital at Hartford, Connecticut. Mother Ann Valencia combined in her character to a rare degree tenderness and strength, mysticism and practical understanding. This account of her life is not only an interesting study of the religious life and the inner workings of a great hospital, but a thoroughly absorbing story. In form the book is a combination of novel and biography. It is a true story about a real person but some of the minor characters are fictitious and some of the incidents are at least partly imaginary. The purpose of the book however is to draw a vivid picture of a great religious personality. In that it is successful.

C. L. S.

The Golden Bough. By James G. Frazer. Macmillan, 1940, pp. xiv + 752. \$1.49.

This is a one volume abridged edition of a famous book reviewed by Dr. S. A. B. Mercer in the issue of October, 1923; the only thing therefore that needs particular notice is the remarkably low price of the latest edition.

A. H. F.